



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HW 2LZ0 E

KE 33131(2)

722  
10-3



HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LIBRARY OF THE

Historical Department,

HARVARD HALL.

*From the Estate  
of  
Prof. Henry W. Torrey.  
27 Nov., 1895.*

LAMONT LIBRARY







LA

**HISTORY**  
**OF**  
**LATIN CHRISTIANITY;**

**INCLUDING THAT OF**  
**THE POPES**  
**TO**  
**THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.**

**BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,**  
**DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.**

**VOLUME II.**

**LONDON:**  
**JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.**  
**1854.**

323a  
H  
216

100

~~M~~

Harvard University  
Historical Department  
From the collection of  
**Prof. H. W. TORREY**  
27 Nov. 1895.

~~M~~

~~11221~~

KE 33131 (2)

HARVARD  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
OCT 1 1955

RECEIVED

8 JUL 1912

Trans. from  
Lamont

LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,  
AND CHARING CROSS.

# CONTENTS

OF

## THE SECOND VOLUME.

### BOOK IV.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### MOHAMMED.

A.D.		PAGE
622	Rise of Mohammedanism . . . . .	5
	Arabia . . . . .	6
	Character of Mohammedanism . . . . .	9
	Ceremonial—Faith . . . . .	11
	The Korân . . . . .	14
	Mohammed—His birth and youth . . . . .	ib.
	Divine mission . . . . .	17
	Persecution and flight—(Hegira) . . . . .	18-19
	Medina . . . . .	20
	The Jews . . . . .	21
630	Mohammed Lord of Mecca . . . . .	22
	Korân becomes intolerant to Jews—to Christians . . . . .	24
	Korân war against mankind . . . . .	28
	Mohammed's views of empire . . . . .	31
	Battle of Muta . . . . .	33

#### CHAPTER II.

##### SUCCESSORS OF MOHAMMED.

	Abubeker—Omar—Othman . . . . .	35
	Conquest of Syria . . . . .	36
636	Fall of Damascus—of Jerusalem . . . . .	40
632-651	Conquest of Persia—of Egypt—and . . . . .	43
647-698	Of Africa . . . . .	44
	Progress of Mohammedanism—Causes—Polygamy . . . . .	44-7
	Extent—Religious consequences . . . . .	49
	Mohammedan civilisation . . . . .	50

## CHAPTER III.

## CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.

A.D.		PAGE
	Christianity in Britain . . . . .	54
597	Augustine . . . . .	57
	Policy of Gregory . . . . .	59
	Relapse into heathenism . . . . .	61
	Christianity in Northumberland—King Edwin . . . . .	62-3
	Penda . . . . .	65
	Aidan . . . . .	67
	Division in Anglo-Saxon Church . . . . .	70
	Anglo-Saxon Christianity . . . . .	72
	Wilfrid . . . . .	74
	Monasticism . . . . .	78

## CHAPTER IV.

## WILFRID — BEDE.

	Wilfrid—Bede . . . . .	80
	Benedict Biscop . . . . .	81
664	Theodorus Archbishop of Canterbury . . . . .	83
	Synod of Eastanfild . . . . .	88
673-785	Bede . . . . .	91
	Anglo-Saxon poetry—Cædmon . . . . .	94
	Aldhelm of Malmesbury . . . . .	96
	Anglo-Saxon laws . . . . .	97

## CHAPTER V.

CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACES BEYOND THE  
ROMAN EMPIRE.

Abt. 650	S. Columban . . . . .	100
610	S. Gall . . . . .	107
Abt. 700	S. Boniface . . . . .	109
	Pope Gregory II. . . . .	110
	Boniface Archbishop of Mentz . . . . .	113
	Monasteries . . . . .	115

## CHAPTER VI.

THE PAPACY FROM THE TIME OF GREGORY THE GREAT  
TO GREGORY II.

604	Sabinianus . . . . .	119
607	Boniface III. . . . .	121
608-625	Boniface IV.—Deusdedit—Boniface V. . . . .	122

# CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

v

A.D.		PAGE
625-638	Honorius I.—Monothelitism . . . . .	123
	Honorius condemned as a heretic . . . . .	125
638	The Ecthesis of the Emperor Heraclius . . . . .	126
	Pope Severinus . . . . .	ib.
	John IV.—Death of Heraclius . . . . .	127
642	Theodorus I.—Excommunicates Pyrrhus and Paul . . . . .	129
649	Martin I. . . . .	130
653	Pope Martin at Constantinople . . . . .	133
657	Pope Eugenius I.—Vitalianus . . . . .	134
663	The Emperor Constans at Rome . . . . .	135
672-678	Adeodatus—Domnus—Agatho . . . . .	136
	Sixth Œcumenic Council . . . . .	ib.
682-701	Leo II. . . . .	138
	Popes Benedict II., John V., Conon, Sergius . . . . .	139
	Quinisextan Council, or Council in Trullo . . . . .	140
702-707	John VI.—John VII.—Sisinnius—Constantine . . . . .	141
716	Gregory II. . . . .	143

## CHAPTER VII.

### ICONOCLASM.

	Iconoclasm . . . . .	144
717	Leo the Isaurian . . . . .	153
726	Edict against images . . . . .	155
	Second edict—Tumults . . . . .	156
	Gregory II.'s letter . . . . .	158
	Second letter . . . . .	162
731	Degradation of Germanus of Constantinople . . . . .	163
	John of Damascus . . . . .	ib.
741	Constantine Copronymus Emperor . . . . .	167
743	Persecutions—The Patriarch Anastasius . . . . .	169
750	Third Council of Constantinople . . . . .	170

## CHAPTER VIII.

### SECOND COUNCIL OF NICEA — CLOSE OF ICONOCLASM.

	The Monk Stephen—Persecutions . . . . .	175-C
775	Death of Copronymus . . . . .	179
780	Leo IV. . . . .	180
	Irene . . . . .	181
783	Tarasius Patriarch . . . . .	182
787	Second Council of Nicea . . . . .	184
	Decree of the Council . . . . .	186
797	Blinding of Constantine by Irene . . . . .	191

A.D.		PAGE
802	Leo the Armenian against image-worship . . . . .	192
821	Murder of Leo . . . . .	194
	Michael the Stammerer Emperor . . . . .	195
829	Theophilus Emperor . . . . .	196
842	Theodora Empress . . . . .	200

## CHAPTER IX.

## SEVERANCE OF GREEK AND LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

	Exarchs of Ravenna . . . . .	204
	Image-worship in Italy—John VII. . . . .	205
715-731	Gregory II. . . . .	206
	The Lombards—Liutprand . . . . .	209-10
730	Council at Rome . . . . .	211
731	Gregory III. . . . .	212
	Council at Rome . . . . .	213
740	Gregory appeals to Charles Martel . . . . .	215
	Charles Martel . . . . .	218

## CHAPTER X.

## HIERARCHY OF FRANCE.

S. Leger . . . . .	223
--------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XI.

## PEPIN KING OF FRANCE.

741	Pope Zacharias . . . . .	227
742	Interview with Liutprand—Peace . . . . .	228-9
	Kings Monks . . . . .	231
751	Pepin King of France . . . . .	233
	Teutonic clergy . . . . .	237
752	Stephen Pope . . . . .	238
	Astolph of Lombardy . . . . .	ib.
754	Stephen sets out for France . . . . .	239
	Carloman in France . . . . .	241
	Pepin in Italy—Retires—Siege of Rome by Lombards . . . . .	242
755	Letters of Pope Stephen . . . . .	242-4
756	Pepin in Italy—Lombards yield—Grant of Pepin . . . . .	245
	Desiderius I. King of the Lombards . . . . .	246
757	Pope Paul I. . . . .	ib.
767	Papacy seized by Toto . . . . .	249
768	Pope Stephen III. . . . .	250
	Alliance of Pope and Lombards . . . . .	253

CHAPTER XII.

CHARLEMAGNE ON THE THRONE.

A.D.		PAGE
771	Carloman and Charles—Proposed marriage with Lombard Princesses . . . . .	254
	Letter of Pope Stephen . . . . .	255
768	Pope Hadrian I. . . . .	256
773	Desiderius before Rome . . . . .	259
773	Hadrian's message to Charlemagne . . . . .	ib.
774	Charlemagne in Rome—Donation . . . . .	261
780-1	Charlemagne's second visit to Rome . . . . .	264
795	Leo III. Pope . . . . .	266
799	Assault on Pope Leo . . . . .	267
800	Charlemagne in Rome . . . . .	268
	Charlemagne Emperor . . . . .	270

BOOK V.

CHAPTER I.

CHARLEMAGNE.

	Empire of Charlemagne . . . . .	275
	Character of Charlemagne . . . . .	279
	The Saxons . . . . .	280
772, &c.	Campaigns of Charlemagne against the Saxons . . . . .	282
	Conversion of Saxons . . . . .	286
	Charlemagne's legislation . . . . .	287
	Transalpine hierarchy—Estates of the Church . . . . .	289-90
	Tithe . . . . .	293
	Monasteries . . . . .	294
	Bishops . . . . .	296
	Parochial clergy . . . . .	297
794	Council of Frankfort . . . . .	298
	Arts and Letters under Charlemagne . . . . .	306

CHAPTER II.

LOUIS THE PIOUS.

	Leo III. Pope . . . . .	309
813	Accession of Louis . . . . .	311
	Diet of Aix-la-Chapelle . . . . .	313
816	Pope Stephen IV. . . . .	314

A.D.		PAGE
817	Pope Paschal I.—Second Diet at Aix-la-Chapelle . . . . .	315
	Law of succession . . . . .	317
822	Diet of Attigny . . . . .	320
	Accusations against Pope Paschal . . . . .	322
824	Death of Paschal—Pope Eugenius I.—Lothair in Rome . . . . .	323
	Weakness of Empire—Duke Bernhard of Septimania . . . . .	324-5
830	Rebellion of sons of Louis . . . . .	326
	Aristocratic hierarchy . . . . .	329
	Pope Valentinus—Gregory IV.—Civil war . . . . .	330-31
833	Field of Lies . . . . .	331
	Penance of Louis . . . . .	332
834	New revolution . . . . .	335
839	Partition of the empire—Death of Louis . . . . .	337
	Claudius of Turin . . . . .	339

## CHAPTER III.

## SARACENS IN ITALY.

844	Pope Sergius II.—Louis (son of Lothair) in Rome . . . . .	340-1
847	Leo IV. Pope—Saracen invasion . . . . .	342
	Benedict III. . . . .	344

## CHAPTER IV.

## NICOLAS I. — IGNATIUS AND PHOTIUS.

857	Deposition of Ignatius—Elevation of Photius at Constantinople . . . . .	347
858	Pope Nicolas I. . . . .	349
862	Council at Constantinople . . . . .	ib.
863	Second Council . . . . .	351
	Photius . . . . .	353
866	Michael the Drunkard . . . . .	354
	Councils at Constantinople . . . . .	354-5
867-877	Exile of Photius . . . . .	356
	Reinstatement by Basil the Macedonian . . . . .	357
879	Acknowledged by Pope John VIII. . . . .	ib.
	Leo the Philosopher Emperor . . . . .	ib.
861	John Archbishop of Ravenna . . . . .	358
	Transalpine hierarchy . . . . .	360
860	Divorce of King Lothair . . . . .	364
862	Pope Nicolas I. interferes . . . . .	365
864	Emperor Louis in Rome . . . . .	366
	Humiliation of great German prelates . . . . .	367
	Hincmar of Rheims . . . . .	368
867	Death and character of Nicolas I. . . . .	372
	False decretals . . . . .	373

CHAPTER V.

HADRIAN II. — HINCMAR OF RHEIMS.

A.D.		PAGE
867	Pope Hadrian II. . . . .	381
869	Lothair at Rome—Death . . . . .	382-3
870	Charles the Bald . . . . .	383
	Answer of Hincmar to the Pope . . . . .	385
	Prince Carloman . . . . .	386
	Hincmar of Laon . . . . .	387
871	Punishment of Carloman and of Hincmar of Laon . . . . .	391

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN VIII. — THE SARACENS — THE DUKES OF LOWER ITALY.

872	Charles the Bald Emperor . . . . .	393
	Danger from Saracens . . . . .	394
	The Dukes of Naples . . . . .	396
878	Empire vacant . . . . .	399
	John VIII. in France—Anathemas . . . . .	400
	Boso King of Provence . . . . .	403
881	Athanasius of Naples . . . . .	405
882	Pope Marinus—Hadrian III.—Stephen V. . . . .	407

CHAPTER VII.

ANARCHY OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE PAPACY.

	Berengar and Guido claim the empire . . . . .	409
891	Pope Formosus . . . . .	410
894	Emperor Arnulf in Italy—Coronation . . . . .	412-13
896	Boniface VII.—Stephen VI. . . . .	414
	Rapid succession of Popes—Romanus—Theodorus—John IX. . . . .	415

CHAPTER VIII.

CONVERSION OF BULGARIA.

863-4	King Bogoris—Cyril—Methodius . . . . .	420
	Questions answered by Pope Nicolas I. . . . .	421
	Moravia . . . . .	425
	Use of Slavian language . . . . .	427

## CHAPTER IX.

## THE NORTHMEN.

A.D.		PAGE
	Their ravages . . . . .	431
	Religion . . . . .	433
	S. Anschar . . . . .	435

## CHAPTER X.

## ALFRED.

	The Danes . . . . .	441
	Anglo-Saxon letters . . . . .	443

## CHAPTER XI.

## THE HUNGARIANS — DEGRADATION OF THE PAPACY.

	Hungarian inroad . . . . .	445
	Abasement of the Papacy . . . . .	446
	Benedict IV.—Leo V. . . . .	448
897	Sergius IV. Pope—Marquisate of Tuscany . . . . .	449
	Theodora and Marozia . . . . .	451
924	John X. . . . .	455
926	Hugh of Provence . . . . .	457
931	Marriage with Marozia—John XI. Pope . . . . .	458
	Alberic—Insurrection of Rome . . . . .	459
936-941	Rapid Papal succession—Leo VII.—Stephen IX.—Marinus II.—Agapetus II. . . . .	460
	John XII.—Octavian . . . . .	464

## CHAPTER XII.

## THE OTHOS ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

951	Otho the Great in Italy . . . . .	465
957	Berengar and Adalbert . . . . .	466
961-2	Pope John XII.—Otho in Rome . . . . .	467-8
	Council at Rome—Degradation of the Pope—Leo VIII. . . . .	468-9
964	John XII. recovers his throne . . . . .	471
965	Benedict—John XIII. . . . .	472
	Liutprand in Constantinople . . . . .	473
972	Death of Otho the Great—Benedict VI. . . . .	474
974	Bonifazio Francone—Benedict VII. . . . .	ib.
983	Death of Otho II. . . . .	475
985	John XIV.—Bonifazio—John XV. . . . .	475-6
996	Otho III. in Italy . . . . .	477
	Gregory V. . . . .	479
	Crescentius—John XVI.—Otho III. in Rome . . . . .	480

## CHAPTER XIII.

## OTHO III. — POPE SILVESTER II.

A.D.		PAGE
	Views of Otho . . . . .	483
	Gerbert . . . . .	486
	Hugh Capet King of France . . . . .	487
987	Arnulf of Rheims . . . . .	488
991	Council of Rheims . . . . .	490
	Gerbert Archbishop . . . . .	493
998	Council of Moisson . . . . .	494
	Gerbert Archbishop of Ravenna . . . . .	495
999	Gerbert Pope—Silvester II. . . . .	496
1002	Death of Otho III. . . . .	497
1003	Death of Silvester II. . . . .	498

## CHAPTER XIV.

## THE TUSCULAN POPES.

1003-12	John XVII.—John XVIII.—Sergius IV. . . . .	500
	Counts of Tusculum—Benedict VIII. . . . .	501
1022	John XIX. . . . .	504
1033	Benedict IX. . . . .	505
	Silvester III.—Gregory VI. buys the Papacy . . . . .	507
1044	Emperor Henry III.—Degradation of Benedict IX. and of Gregory VI. . . . .	508

## CORRIGENDA—VOL. II.

- P. 90, bottom line, *for their read the.*  
 P. 109, side date, *for 600 read 700.*  
 P. 111, „ *for 724 read 721.*  
 P. 112, „ *for 122, 123, 123 read 722, 723, 723.*  
 P. 249-50, „ *for 777, 778 read 767, 768.*  
 P. 474, „ *for 297 read 972.*  
 P. 485, „ *for 1080 read 1000.*



HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

---

BOOK IV.

VOL. II.

B

POPES.		PATRIARCHS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.		EXARCHES OF RAVENNA.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
		Cyriacus	610			Callinicus	602
Gregory I. died	604			608 Phocas	610		
604 Sabinianus	606					608 Smaragdus (re-	610
606 Boniface III.	607					stored)	
608 Boniface IV.	615	610 Sergius	608	610 Heraclius	641	610 John Remigius	615
615 Deusdedit	618					615 Eleutherius	619
619 Boniface V.	625					619 Isaac	643
625 Honorius I.	638						
638 Severinus	640	638 Pyrrhus, deposed	641				
640 John IV.	648	641 Paul II.	654	641 Constantine III.,			
				Heraclonas			
642 Theodorus I.	640			643 Constantine II.	668	643 Calliopas	650
649 Martin I.	655						
						650 Olympius	658
654 Eugenius I.	657	654 Pyrrhus, reinstated	655			658 Calliopas again	667
657 Vitalian	672	655 Peter	668				
		666 Thomas II.	680				
		669 John V.	675	668 Constantine Pogo-			
672 Adeodatus	676	675 Constantine, deposed	677	natus	686		
676 Donus	678	677 Theodorus, deposed	678				
678 Agatho	681	678 George I.	683				
682 Leo II.	683	683 Theodorus, rein-	686	686 Justinian II.	694		
683 (?) Benedict II.	685	stated					
685 Conon	687	686 Paul III.	688			687 John Pistor	708
687 Paschal (antipope)	692						
687 Theodorus		688 Callinicus, deposed	705				
687 Sergius I.	701			684 Leontius I.	687		
				687 Tiberius	704		
701 John VI.	705					708 Theophylact	710
		705 Cyrus, deposed	712	704 Justinian II., re-			
705 John VII.	707			stored	711		
708 Sisinnius		712 John VI., deposed	715	711 Philipicus	713	710 John Risocopes	718
708 Constantine I.	715			713 Anastasius II.	715	712 Scholasticus	725
		715 Germanus, deposed	721	715 Theodosius III.	717		
715 Gregory II.	721			717 Leo the Isaurian	741		
		721 Anastasius	738			725 Paul the Patrician	727
731 Gregory III.	741	" deposed	746			727 Eutychius the Eu-	738
741 Zacharias	742	" died	754	741 Constantine Copro-		nuch	
742 Stephen II.				nymus	775	Conquered by Lombards.	
743 Stephen III.	757						
		754 Constantine, banished	768				
		—beheaded					
757 Paul I.	767	768 Nicetas the Exarch	780				
767 Constantine II.	768						
768 Philip							
768 Stephen IV.	772						
772 Hadrian I.	795						
		780 Paul IV., deposed	784	775 Leo IV.	780		
		784 Thrasius	806	780 Constantine Porphy-			
				rogenitus, with			
				Irene	797		
795 Leo III.	816			797 Irene			
		806 Nicophorus, de-	815				
		posed					
		815 Theodorus Cantuarus	821				

LOMBARD KINGS.		KINGS OF FRANCE.			CALIFHS.
A.D.	A.D.	<i>Burgundy.</i>	<i>Austrasia.</i>	<i>Neustria.</i>	A.D.
589 Agilolf	616	A.D. 601 Thierry II.	Theodebert II.	A.D. Chlotaire II.	
		614 Chlotaire II., alone, 626			
616 Theodelinda and Adeilwald	638	<i>Part of Aquitaine.</i>			622 Mohammed
636 Arivald	638	636 Dagobert	Charibert	636	632 Abubeker
638 Rotharis	654	Dagobert, alone, 637		<i>Neustria.</i>	634 Omar
		<i>Austrasia.</i>			
		637 Sigebert II.	654	Clovis II.	655
654 Rodwald	659	654 Childeric II.		656 Chlotaire III. (Queen Bathildis guardian.)	656 Ali
659 Aribert	668				660 Monwajah
668 Gondibert	668	668 Childeric II., alone.			
668 Grimoald	678	<i>Part of Austrasia.</i>			
		678 Thierry III.	678 Dagobert II.		
678 Garibald. Pertharit	680	679 Thierry III., alone, 691			679 Yezid
680 Cunibert with Per- tharit	691				685 Abdalmelik
691 Cunibert alone	701	(687 Pepin, Mayor of the Palace, 714)			
701 Liutprand		690 Clovis III.	695		
708 Aribert II.	718	695 Childeric III.	711		705 Walid I.
718 Ansgarand	718	711 Dagobert III.			714 Suleiman
718 Liutprand	748				717 Omar II. 719 Yezid III.
		716 Chilperic II. Chlotaire IV.			726 Hildjam
		720 Thierry IV.			
		(726 Charles Martel, Mayor of Palace)			
748 Hildebrand	748	748 Childeric III.	751		748 Walid II. 748 Yezid III. 744 Ibrahim 745 Merwan 741 Abdalla the Abbasside
744 Ezech Duke of Friuli					750 Abugrafar Almansor
750 Astolphus	756	751 Pepin			
756 Desiderius	774				775 Mohammed Manades
		768 Charlemagne and Carloman			785 Musa 786 Haroun Alrashid
		778 Charlemagne, alone			

POPES.		PATRIARCHS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.		EXARCHS OF RAVENNA.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
		Cyriacus	610			Callinicus	602
Gregory I. died	604			602 Phocas	610	608 Smaragdus (re-stored)	610
604 Sabinianus	606						
606 Boniface III.	607			610 Heraclius	641	610 John Bonigius	615
606 Boniface IV.	615	610 Sergius	636			615 Eleutherius	619
						619 Isaac	643
615 Deusdedit	618						
619 Boniface V.	625						
625 Honorius I.	638						
638 Severinus	640	639 Pyrrhus, deposed	641				
640 John IV.	648	641 Paul II.	654	641 Constantine III., Heraclionas			
642 Theodorus I.	646			642 Constant II.	668	648 Calliopas	650
649 Martin I.	655						
						650 Olympius	652
654 Eugenius I.	657	654 Pyrrhus, reinstated	655			652 Calliopas again	657
		655 Peter	666				
657 Vitalian	672						
		666 Thomas II.	669				
		669 John V.	675	668 Constantine Pogonatus	685		
672 Adeodatus	676	675 Constantine, deposed	677				
676 Donus	678	677 Theodorus, deposed	678				
678 Agatho	681	678 George I.	683				
682 Leo II.	683	683 Theodorus, reinstated	686	683 Justinian II.	694		
683 (†) Benedict II.	685	686 Paul III.	693			687 John Platon	702
683 Conon	687						
687 Paschal (antipope)	692						
687 Theodorus				684 Leontius I.	697		
687 Sergius I.	701			687 Tiberius	704		
		688 Callinicus, deposed	708			708 Theophylact	710
701 John VI.	705			704 Justinian II., re-stored	711		
		705 Cyrus, deposed	712			710 John Eusebius	712
705 John VII.	707			711 Philippicus	713		
708 Sisinnius		712 John VI., deposed	713	712 Anastasius II.	718	712 Scholasticus	725
708 Constantine I.	715			713 Theodosius III.	717		
		715 Germanus, deposed	721	717 Leo the Isaurian	741		
715 Gregory II.	721						
		721 Anastasius	728			725 Paul the Patrician	727
721 Gregory III.	741	" deposed	740			727 Eutychius the Eunuch	732
741 Zacharias	742	" died	754	741 Constantine Copronymus	775	Conquered by Lombards.	
742 Stephen II.							
743 Stephen III.	757						
		754 Constantine, banished—beheaded	766				
757 Paul I.	767	766 Nicetas the Eunuch	780				
767 Constantine II.	768						
768 Philip							
768 Stephen IV.	772						
772 Hadrian I.	786						
		780 Paul IV., deposed	784	775 Leo IV.	780		
		784 Tarasius	806	780 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, with Irene	797		
795 Leo III.	816			797 Irene			
		806 Nicophorus, deposed	815				
		815 Theodorus Canonicus	821				

LOMBARD KINGS.		KINGS OF FRANCE.			CALIPHS.
A.D.	A.D.	<i>Burgundy.</i>	<i>Austrasia.</i>	<i>Neustria.</i>	A.D.
580 Agilulf	616	A.D. 601 Thierri II.	Theodebert II.	A.D. Chlotaire II.	
		614 Chlotaire II., alone, 638			
616 Theodelinda and Adelwald	686		<i>Part of Aquitaine.</i>		622 Mohammed
686 Arivald	688	688 Dagobert	Charibert	688	632 Abubeker
688 Rotharis	654	Dagobert, alone, 687		634 Omar	
		<i>Austrasia.</i>	<i>Neustria.</i>		
		687 Sigebert II.	654 Clovis II.	655	
654 Rodwald	658	654 Childeric II.			644 Othman
658 Aribert	668		656 Chlotaire III. (Queen Bathilda's guardian.)	668	656 Ali
668 Gondibert	668				660 Mouwjah
668 Grimoald	672				
		668 Childeric II., alone.			
672 Garibald. Pertharit	680		<i>Part of Austrasia.</i>		
		672 Thierri III.	672 Dagobert II.		
680 Cunibert with Pertharit	691	679 Thierri III., alone, 691			679 Yazid
691 Cunibert alone	701	(687 Pepin, Mayor of the Palace, 714)			685 Abdulmelek
701 Liutprand		690 Clovis III.	695		
702 Aribert II.	712	695 Childabert III.	711		
					703 Walid I.
712 Ansprand	712	711 Dagobert III.			
712 Liutprand	742				714 Suleiman
					717 Omar II.
					719 Yazid III.
					722 Hicham
		(736 Charles Martel, Mayor of Palace)			
742 Hildebrand	742	742 Childeric III.	751		742 Walid II.
744 Raschid Duke of Friuli					742 Yezid III.
750 Astolphus	756	751 Pepin			744 Ibrahim
756 Desiderius	774				745 Merwan
					746 Abdalla the Abbasside
					752 Abuyyasar Almansor
		768 Charlemagne and Carloman			
		772 Charlemagne, alone			775 Mohammed Manades
					785 Muan
					786 Haroun Alrashed

## BOOK IV.

### CHAPTER I.

#### MOHAMMED.

THE seventh century of Christianity was destined to behold a new religious revolution, only inferior in the extent of its religious and social influence to Christianity itself.

Roman East  
at commence-  
ment of  
seventh  
century.

Christianity might seem, notwithstanding her internal dissensions, while slowly subduing the whole of Europe, to be still making gradual encroachments in Asia, and at least to apprehend no formidable invasion within her own frontier. The conflict which had raged on the eastern boundaries of the Roman world, in which at one time the Persians had become masters of Syria and plundered the religious treasures of Jerusalem, was a war of the two empires of Rome and Persia, not of Christianity and Fire-worship. The danger which threatened the Byzantine empire, and which, if unaverted, would have yielded up Asia, and even Constantinople, to the followers of Zoroaster, had been arrested by the great military ability and enterprise of Heraclius, the successor of the tyrant Phocas on the throne. But though

War of  
Persia.

Persian conquest, had it spread over Asia Minor and Syria and into Europe, might have brought on a dangerous collision with the religion of the conquerors, yet the issue could not eventually have been fatal, even to the dominance of Christianity. Zoroastrianism had failed to propagate itself with any great success in the parts of Christian Armenia which it had subjugated: nor can we imagine that religion, even when advancing under the victorious banner of its believers, as likely to obtain any firm hold on the inhabitants of Western Asia or Europe, still less as

tending to extirpate the deep-rooted Christianity of those regions.

In the meantime, in an obscure district of a country esteemed by the civilised world as beyond its boundaries, a savage, desert, and almost inaccessible region, suddenly arose an antagonist religion, which was to reduce the followers of Zoroaster to a few scattered communities, to invade India, and tread under foot the ancient Brahminism, as well as the more widespread Buddhism, even beyond the Ganges; to wrest her most ancient and venerable provinces from Christianity; to subjugate by degrees the whole of her Eastern dominions, and Roman Africa from Egypt to the Straits of Gibraltar; to assail Europe at its western extremity; to possess the greater part of Spain, and even to advance to the banks of the Loire; more than once to make the elder Rome tremble for her security, and finally to establish itself in triumph within the new Rome of Constantine. Asiatic Christianity sank more and more into obscurity. It dragged on its existence within the Mohammedan empire as a contemptuously tolerated religion; in the Byzantine empire it had still strength to give birth to new controversies—that of Iconoclasm, and even still later that concerning the divine light. It was not without writers, in learning, perhaps, and theologic argument, superior to any in the West—John of Damascus, Eustathius of Thessalonica. Yet its aggressive vigour had entirely departed, and it was happy to be allowed inglorious repose, to take no part in that great war waged by the two powers, now the only two living, active, dominant powers, which contested the dominion of the world—Mohammedanism and Latin Christianity. These implacable adversaries might appear to divide mankind into two unmingling, irreconcilable races. Like the Iran and Touran of the remoter East, the realm of light and the realm of darkness, each is constantly endeavouring to push forward its barriers, appearing on every side, or advancing into the heart of the hostile territory. The realm of darkness, as regards civilisation, at times might seem to be the realm of light, the realm of light that of darkness; till eventually Mohammedanism sank back into

Mohammedanism in appearance.

its primeval barbarism, Latin Christianity, or, rather, the Christianity of later Europe, emerged into its full, it may be hoped, yet growing authority, as the religion, not only of truth, but of civilisation.

Arabia, the parent of this new religion, had been a world within itself; the habits and character of the people might seem both to secure them from the invasion of foreign conquerors and to prohibit them from more than a desultory invasion of other countries. Divided into almost countless petty kingdoms, an aggregate of small, independent, and immemorially hostile tribes, they had no bond of union to blend them into a powerful confederacy. The great empires of the East, of Greece and of Rome, had aspired to universal sovereignty, while these wandering tribes of the desert, and even the more settled and flourishing kingdoms of Southern Arabia had pursued unknown and undisturbed their intestine warfare. A nominal and precarious sovereignty had been exercised by some of the Asiatic conquerors over the frontier tribes; but the poverty and irreclaimable wandering habits of most of these, with the impracticable nature of the country, had protected from the ambition of the conquerors the southern regions, of which the wealth and fertility had been greatly exaggerated, and which were supposed to produce all those rich commodities, in fact, transmitted to them from India. Arabia formed no part of the great eastern monarchies. Alexander passed on from Egypt and Syria to the remoter East. His successors in Egypt and in Syria, the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, were in general content with commercial relations, carried on with Arabia or through Arabia. The Romans, who might seem to scrutinize the world in order that nothing might escape their ambition, had once or twice turned their arms towards the fabled wealth of Arabia.\* The unsuccessful, if not ignominious, result of the expedition of Ælius Gallus had taught how little was to be gained, how much hazarded, in such a warfare. The Romans contented themselves with the acquisition of Petra, a city not strictly Arabian,

\* The "*intactis nunc Arabum invides gazis*" of Horace, shows the relation in which Arabia stood to the rapacity and to the arms of Rome.

but Edomite in its origin, though for some centuries occupied by the Nabatean Arabs, a commercial emporium; as a station between the East and the Roman world, of the greatest importance, and adorned, during the age of the Antonines, with magnificent buildings in that colossal half-barbarous Roman style with which at that time they built temples in so many of the great cities of Syria, Asia Minor and Egypt.

If Arabia offered no great temptation to the foreign invader from the civilised world, the civilised world had as little dread of any dangerous irruption from these wild and disunited tribes. Here and there, perhaps, beyond the proper limits of Arabia, in districts, however, which seemed to belong to their marauding habits rather than to the settled cultivation of more advanced nations, upon the eastern frontier of Syria and towards the Euphrates, had arisen Arabian kingdoms. The Nabatean Petra had attained to some power during the first period of Christianity, had waged an aggressive war against Rome, and even gained possession of Damascus. This territory, however, had become a Roman province; but down to the reign of Justinian petty Saracenic chieftains who assumed the name of kings were engaged on either side in the interminable wars between Rome and Persia. Yet while the prolific North and East were periodically discharging their teeming hordes upon Asia and Europe, Arabia might seem either not gifted with this overflow of population, or to consume it within her own limits. The continual internal wars; polygamy, which became more unfavourable to the increase of the population from the general usage of destroying female infants;<sup>b</sup> the frugal, nomadic, and even the imaginative character of the race, which seemed to attach them to their own soil, and to suppress all desire of conquest in softer, less open, more settled regions, conspired to maintain the immutable character of Arabia and of the Arab people; their national and tribal pride, their ancient traditions, their virtues, their polity, and even their commerce, which absorbed the activity of the more enterprising, might appear to coop

<sup>b</sup> Weil, p. 19.

within itself this peculiar people, as neither destined nor qualified to burst the limits of their own peninsula, or to endanger the peace, the liberties, or the religion of the world.

On a sudden, when probably only vague rumours had reached the courts of Persia or of Constantinople of the religious revolution which had taken place in Medina and Mecca, a revolution which might seem to plunge the whole region in still more desperate internal hostility, Arabia appeared in arms against mankind. A religious fanaticism, almost unexampled in its depth and intensity, had silenced all the fierce feuds of centuries; the tribes and kingdoms had become one; armies, seemingly inexhaustible, with all the wild courage of marauding adventure and the terrible discipline of stubborn unity of purpose, poured forth, one after another from the desert; and at their head appeared, not indeed the apostle himself (he had discharged his mission in organising this terrible confederacy), but a military sovereign who united in himself the civil and spiritual supremacy, whose authority rested on the ardent attachment of a clan towards its chief, and the blind and passive obedience of a sect to a religious leader; the reigning Caliph was king and pontiff, according to the oriental theory of sovereignty the father of his people, but likewise the successor of the Prophet, the delegate of God.

Mohammedanism appeared before the world as a stern and austere monotheism, but it was a practical not a speculative monotheism.<sup>c</sup> It had nothing abstract, indistinct, intellectual in its primary notion of the Godhead. Allah was no philosophic first cause, regulating the universe by established laws, while itself stood aloof in remote and unapproachable majesty. It was an ever-present, ever-working energy, still accomplishing its own purposes.<sup>d</sup> Its predestinarianism was not a fixed and predetermined law wrought out by the obedient elements of the human world, but the actual, immediate operation of the Deity,

<sup>c</sup> One of the sublimest descriptions of God may be found in the second chapter of the Koran, Sale's translation, i. p. 47.

<sup>d</sup> See the fine passage, ch. vi. vol. i. p. 166, &c.

governing all things by his sole will,\* and through his passive ministers.† It threw aside with implacable and disdainful aversion all those gradations as it were of divinity which approximated man to God and God to man—the Asiatic or Gnostic Æons and Emanations; the impersonated Ideas of the later Platonism, with their all-comprehending Logos; above all, the co-equal Persons of the Christian Trinity. Nothing existed but the Creator and the Creation: the Creator one in undistinguished, undivided Unity, the Creation, which comprehended every being intermediate between God and man: angels, devils, genii, all owed their being to almighty power, and were liable to death or to extinction.

Mohammedanism, in more respects than one, was a republication of Mosaic Judaism, with its strong principle of national and religious unity (for <sup>Mohammedanism.</sup> wherever it went it carried its language), with its law simplified to a few rigid and unswerving observances, and the world for its land of Canaan; the world which it was commissioned to subdue to the faith of Islam, and to possess in the right of conquest.

Yet nothing was less simple than the popular Mohammedanism. It rationalised, if it might be called Rationalism, only in its conception of the Deity. It had its poetic<sup>s</sup> element, its imaginative excitement, adapted to the youthful barbarianism of the state of society, and to the Oriental character. It created, or rather acknowledged, an intermediate world, it dealt prodigally in angelic appearances, and believed in another incorporeal, or, rather, subtly-corporeal race, between angels and men; the genii, created out of a finer substance, but more nearly akin to man in

\* "It is he who hath created the heavens and the earth in truth; and whenever he saith unto a thing, Be, it is." This whole chapter is full of striking passages. "And whomsoever God shall please to direct, he will open his breast to receive the faith of Islam; but whomsoever he shall please to lead into error, he will render his breast strait and narrow, as though he were climbing up to heaven (i.e. attempting an impossibility). Thus does God in-

flict a terrible punishment on those who believe not."—p. 178.

† "Though men and angels and devils conspire together to put one single atom in motion, or cause it to cease its motion without his will and approbation, they would not be able to do it."—Creed of orthodox Mohammedans in Ockley, vol. ii. p. li.

§ They (the idolators) say the Korân is a confused heap of dreams; nay, he has forged it; nay, he is a poet.—ch. xxii. v. li. p. 152.

their weaknesses and trials.<sup>b</sup> The whole life of man was passed under the influence, sometimes in direct communion with these half-spiritual beings.<sup>1</sup> Mohammedanism borrowed its poetic machinery from all the existing religions—from Magianism, Orientalism, Judaism, Christianity. No religion was less original.<sup>k</sup> Its assertion of the divine unity was a return to Judaism, a stern negation at once of the vulgar polytheism which prevailed among the ruder Arab tribes, and of the mysterious doctrines of Trinitarian Christianity. As to the intermediate world it only popularised still further the popular belief. Its angels were those already familiar to the general mind through Talmudic Judaism and Christianity; its genii were those of the common Eastern superstition. The creation, as affirmed in Islam, was strictly biblical;<sup>m</sup> the history of man was that of the Old Testament, recognised in the New, though not without a large admixture of Jewish legend. The forefathers of the Mohammedan, as of the Jewish and Christian religions, were Adam, Noah, Abraham; and to the older prophets of God, among whom were included Moses and Jesus, were only added two local prophets, sent on special missions to certain of the Arab tribes, to Ad and to Thamud.<sup>n</sup> Even Mohammedan fable had none of the inventive originality of fiction.

<sup>b</sup> "He created men of dried clay, like an earthen vessel, but he created the genii of fire, clear from the smoke."—ch. lv. v. ii. p. 209: compare vi. i. p. 178.

<sup>1</sup> Mohammedan tradition adopts for the genii the definition of the *dæmons* in the Talmud. They have three qualities of angels: I. They have wings. II. They pass from one end of the world to the other. III. They know future events, but not certainly: they only hear them from behind the curtain. They have three human qualities. I. They eat and drink. II. They have carnal appetites. III. They die.—Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed*, p. 83.

<sup>k</sup> In this respect, how different from Christianity! The religion of Christ, on its first promulgation, had to introduce into the world new conceptions of the Deity, new forms of worship, its sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, new vices, and new virtues; a new his-

tory of man, both as to his creation and his destiny; new religious ancestors, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, the Jewish prophets, besides the divine author of the religion and his apostles. All these names were almost strange to the Roman world, and were to supersede those already sacred and familiar to the thoughts of all the Christian converts.

<sup>m</sup> Compare Geiger, p. 64; but Mohammed was impatient of the ascribing *rest* to God on the seventh day. The strictness of the Jewish Sabbath was enforced upon them for their obstinacy in preferring the day of the supposed *rest* of the Almighty to Friday, the proper day of divine worship.—ch. xvi. v. ii. p. 94.

<sup>n</sup> These were no doubt the mythic forms of some historic events; the impersonated memorials of some fearful calamities ascribed to the hand of God; and still living in Arabic tradition.

There is scarcely a legend which is not either from the Talmud, or rather the source of most of the Talmud, the religious tradition of the Jews<sup>o</sup> or the spurious (not the genuine) Gospels of Christianity. The last day, the judgment, the resurrection, hell, and paradise, though invested in a circumstantiality of detail, much of it foreign, as far as we can judge, to the Pharisaic notions of our Saviour's day, and singularly contrasting with the modest and less material images of the New Testament, were already parts of the common creed. The Koran has scarcely surpassed the grosser notions of another life which were already received by the Talmudic Jews and the Judaising Christians, the Chiliasts of the early ages. It only adapted this materialism to the fears and hopes of a Bedouin and a polygamous people. It may be doubted whether it goes beyond the terrific imaginations of the Talmudists in those minute and particular effects of hell-fire which glare in all its pages.<sup>p</sup> In its paradise it dwelt on that most exquisite luxury to a wanderer in the desert, perennial rivers of cool pure water; and it added a hareem to the joys of the blessed.<sup>q</sup>

In the rites and ceremonial of Islam there was nothing which required any violent disruption of religious habits: its four great precepts only gave a new impulse and a new direction to established religious observances. I. *Prayer*, is the universal language of all religion; and the sense of the perpetual presence, the direct and immediate agency of God in all human things, enforced by the whole Mohammedan creed, as well as the concentration of all earthly

<sup>o</sup> Sale has traced in his notes many of the fables in the Korân to their Talmudic or Rabbinical sources. A Prize Essay, on a theme proposed by the University of Bonn, "Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum genommen," by Abraham Geiger, Rabbi of Wiesbaden, is modest, sensible, and contains much curious information. The names for Paradise and Hell, the garden of Eden, and Gehenna, are Hebrew; and he gives twelve other words in the Korân, including Shechinah, all taken from Rabbinical Judaism.

<sup>p</sup> Korân passim, e.g. "And they who believe not shall have garments of

fire fitted unto them, boiling water shall be poured upon their heads, their bowels shall be dissolved thereby, and also their skins, and they shall be beaten with maces of iron. So often as they shall endeavour to get out of hell because of the anguish of their torments, they shall be dragged into the same, and their tormentors shall say unto them, 'Taste ye the pains of burning.'" —ch. xxii. v. ii. p. 169.

<sup>q</sup> For Paradise, ch. xlviii. ii. p. 377. "The rivers of incorruptible water, of milk, of wine, of clarified honey, and all kinds of fruits." Still more fully, lv. ii. 411.

worship on one single, indivisible God, has maintained a strict and earnest spirit of adoration throughout the Mohammedan world. II. The natural sympathies of man; the narrower, yet impressive, humanity of the Old Testament, which had bound the Jew to relieve the distressed of his brethren with a generosity which, contrasting with his apparent hostility to the rest of mankind, had moved the wonder of the heathen; the more beautiful, the prodigal, the universal charity of the Christian, perhaps the hospitable habits of the Arabs, had already consecrated *Almsgiving* as among the highest of religious virtues; and Mohammedanism did not degenerate in this respect from what may be called her religious parents. III. As to *Fasting*, the Ramadan was but Lent under another name. IV. The Christianity of the Gospel had in vain abrogated the peculiar sanctity of places. The nature of man, yet imperfectly spiritualised, had sunk back to the old excitements of devotion; the grave of the Redeemer had become to the Christian what the site of the Temple was to the Jew; and the Koran, by turning the hearts of all its votaries to the Holy Cities, to Medina and Mecca, availed itself of the universal passion for *pilgrimages*.<sup>†</sup>

The six great articles in the faith of Islam were in like manner the elemental truths of all religions: though peculiarly expressed, they were neither repugnant to human reason nor to prevalent habits of thought. Most men, in some form, believed—I. In God. II. In his Angels. III. In his Scriptures (in divine revelation). IV. In his Prophets. V. In the Resurrection and Day of Judgment. VI. In God's absolute decree and predetermination of good and evil, though this was softened in most creeds into a vague acknowledgment of God's providential government.

The one new and startling article in the creed of Islam was the divine mission of the prophet Mohammed, the apostle of God. Yet Mohammed was but the successor of other prophets; the last of the long and unfailing line of divine messengers to man. Mankind in general might demand miraculous and supernatural proofs of a prophetic

<sup>†</sup> Gregory the Great mentions pilgrimages to Mount Sinai as still performed in his day, and by women.—Epist. iii. 44.

mission. The Jew might sullenly disclaim a prophet sprung from the bastard race of Ishmael; the Christian might assume the gospel to be the final and conclusive message to man; but Mohammed averred that his mission was vouched by the one great miracle, the Koran; that he was foreshown both in the Law and in the Gospel, though these prophecies had been obscured or falsified by the jealousy of the dominant party among the Jews and Christians. Mohammed himself remains, and must remain, an historic problem: his character, his motives, his designs are all equally obscure. Was the Prophet <sup>Mohammed.</sup> possessed with a lofty indignation at the grovelling idolatry of his countrymen? Had he contrasted the sublime simplicity of the Mosaic unity of God with the polytheism of the Arabs; or, that which appeared to him only the more subtle and disputatious polytheism of the Christians? Had he the lofty political ambition of uniting the fierce and hostile tribes into one confederacy, of forming Arabia into a nation, and so of becoming the founder of a dynasty and an empire; and did he imagine his simple religion as the bond of the confederacy? Did he contemplate from the first foreign conquest or foreign proselytism? or did his more pliant ambition grow out of and accommodate itself to the circumstances of the time, submit to change and modification, and only fully develope itself according to existing exigencies? At this distance of time, and through the haze of adoring and of hostile tradition, it is difficult to trace clearly the outward actions of the Prophet, how much more the inward impulses, the thoughts and aspirations of his secret spirit. To the question whether Mohammed was hero, sage, impostor, or fanatic, or blended, and blended in what proportions, these conflicting elements in his character? the best reply is the favourite reverential phrase of Islam, "God knows."

\* Maracci wrote of Mohammed with the learning, but in the spirit, of a monk. With Prideaux he is a vulgar impostor. Spanheim began to take a higher view of his character. Sale and Gagnier, while vindicating him from the coarse invectives of former writers, kindled into admiration, which was ac-

cused of approaching to belief. With Boulanvilliers, he rose into a benefactor of the human race; with White and his coadjutors he became the subject of some fine pulpit declamation. Gibbon is brilliant, full, on the whole fair; but his brilliancy on the propagation of Mohammedanism singularly contrasts

The Koran itself is not above suspicion, at least as far as its absolute integrity and authenticity. It was put together some time after the death of Mohammed,<sup>†</sup> avowedly not in the exact order of its delivery. It is not certain whether it contains all that the Prophet revealed, or those revelations in their original and unaltered form.<sup>u</sup>

Mohammed<sup>x</sup> was an orphan of a noble family; after the death of his parents he was maintained, first by his grandfather, afterwards by his father's brother. The first twenty-five years of his life passed in obscurity, which the earlier and more authoritative tradition has not ventured to embellish with wonders ominous of his future greatness.<sup>y</sup>

Chadijah, a wealthy widow of his kindred, chose Mohammed *the faithful* (his character had gained him that honourable appellation) to conduct her commercial affairs. He travelled with this charge to Syria,<sup>z</sup> and his success

with his cold, critical view of that of Christianity. Passing over Savary, Volney, in our own times we have the elaborate biography of Dr. Weil, whom scarcely anything has escaped, and Causin de Perceval's *Histoire des Arabes* (Paris, 1848), a work of admirable industry and learning, which, with the history and genealogy of the early tribes, embraces the time of Mohammed and his two successors. Major Price, whose contributions to the history of Mohammedanism, from the Shiite (the Persian) traditions (all which we had before were Sunnite and Arabic), are invaluable, of Mohammed himself gives us nothing new. But Col. Vans Kennedy furnishes some extracts from Tabari, a writer some centuries earlier than any of the known biographers of the Prophet, Elmacin and Abulfeda. Tabari wrote within three centuries of the Hejira, and his account is at once the most striking and most credible which has appeared in Europe. Col. Vans Kennedy's own appreciation of the Prophet (which may be overlooked in a criticism on Voltaire's *Mahomet*) is the most just with which I am acquainted.—See *Bombay Transactions*, vol. iii. This passage appears to have escaped the notice of Dr. Weil, whose recent "*Mohammed der Prophet*" is not only laborious, but also candid and comprehensive.

<sup>†</sup> In the reign of Abubeker, who em-

ployed Mohammed's secretary, Zeid Abu Thabit, Zeid collected every extant fragment which was in different hands, written on parchment, on leather, on palm leaves, on bones, or stones.—Weil, *Mohammed der Prophet*, p. 349; Causin de Perceval, *Histoire des Arabes*.

<sup>u</sup> My own judgment is in favour of the authenticity of the Koran (but I know it only from translations). The evident suggestion of the different chapters by the exigencies of different events, and the manifest contradictions, are proofs of its antiquity. The convenient doctrine of abrogation, by which a later sentence annuls a former, and which seems to have been admitted from the first, implies the general integrity of the book.<sup>a</sup> Dr. Weil believes that though the Koran must not be considered without omission or interpolation, there is no *important* change, addition, or omission. But see on Othman's revision—Weil, *die Chalifen*, note, i. p. 168.

<sup>x</sup> Mohammed born April, 570.

<sup>y</sup> For the later traditions, wild and fantastic enough, see Dr. Weil, p. 23, note 6, and 26, note 1.

<sup>z</sup> Bosra is named as the mart to which Mohammed conducted the caravan of Chadijah. The admiration of ships (as

<sup>a</sup> There are 225 verses which contain doctrines or laws recalled by later revelations.—Weil, p. 355.

was so great in comparison with that of the former agents of Chadijah, that on his return the grateful widow, moved, according to the simpler account, by the prosperity of her trade in his hands, according to the more marvellous, by wonders which took place on his journey, bestowed herself and her wealth on the young and handsome merchant.\*

Twelve more years, from his marriage at the age of twenty-eight, passed away. In his fortieth year, that eventful period in oriental life,<sup>b</sup> the Prophet began to listen to the first intimations of his divine mission.

The caves of mount Hira, in the immediate neighbourhood of Mecca, were already hallowed, it is said, by Arabian superstition. During one of the holy months<sup>c</sup> men were accustomed to retire to a kind of hermitage, built or scooped out of the rocks, for devout meditation: that meditation which, in an imaginative people, is so apt to kindle into communion with the unearthly and invisible. It was in one of these caves that Mohammed received his first communication from heaven.<sup>d</sup> But the form assumed by the vision, the illusion, or the daring conception of Mohammed, showed plainly in what school he had received his religious impressions. It was none of the three hundred and sixty-six deities of the old Arabian religion, or the astral influences of the dominant Tsabaism, it was Gabriel, the divine messenger, hallowed in the Jewish and the Christian scriptures; who appeared as a mighty and majestic figure, with his feet upon the earth and his head in the heavens.<sup>e</sup> After this solemn interview, as Moham-

one of the most wonderful gifts of God), which perpetually occurs in the Korân, leads me to suspect that the writer had seen more of maritime scenes, in one of the ports of Syria perhaps, than what he may have gathered from accidental glimpses of the navigation of the Red Sea.

\* For the description of Mohammed's person, see Dr. Weil, p. 340; Caussin de Perceval, iii. 332.

<sup>b</sup> Some intended analogy with the life of Moses might be suspected; but 40, it is well known, is the indefinite number in the East, and no doubt in many cases it has been assumed to cover ignorance of a real date.

<sup>c</sup> The four holy months, when peace

reigned through Arabia, were the first, the seventh, the eleventh, the twelfth. Islam afterwards annulled the holy months as far as war with *unbelievers*.

<sup>d</sup> Each family had its hermitage; that of Hashem, to which Mohammed belonged, was peculiarly disposed to this kind of devotion.

<sup>e</sup> Chadijah is represented as altogether ignorant of Gabriel; and it was only from the information she obtained from a relative (Warkeh ben Nussul), a learned Christian, that she learned the name and rank of the angel. Yet she is afterwards said to have been well acquainted with the Pentateuch and the Evangelists.

med walked along (so fully was his mind wrapt in its vision), the stones and clods seemed to exclaim, "Prophet of God." By day the inanimate works of God thus summoned him to his office, by night the angel of God perpetually haunted his slumbers, and renewed his call. The incredulous Mohammed suspected that these were but the awful workings of insanity. His faithful wife consoled him with the praise of his virtues, which could not be so cruelly tried by God. Chadijah at length put these revelations to a singular and characteristic test. They were alone in their chamber when the figure appeared. Chadijah was sitting, as became a chaste matron, shrouded in her veil.<sup>5</sup> She took the Prophet in her arms and said, "Dost thou now see it?" The Prophet said, "I do." She cast off her veil, her head and face were uncovered: "Dost thou now see it?" "I do not." "Glad tidings to thee, O Mohammed," exclaimed Chadijah, "it is not a divi, but an angel; for had it been a divi it would not have disappeared and respected my unveiled face." The visions became more frequent and distinct. At length, on the mountain of Hira, the angel stood before Mohammed in defined and almost human form. Mohammed, still suspecting his own insanity, fled to the summit of the mountain to cast himself headlong from it. The angel caught him under his wing, and as he reposed on his bosom commanded him to read. "I cannot read,"<sup>h</sup> replied Mohammed. "Repeat then!" And the angel communicated to the Prophet the revelation of Islam. Mohammed on his return to his house related to his wife the personal appearance of the angel, and spoke of his mysterious communication. A short time after he lay down,<sup>1</sup> cold and

<sup>1</sup> Tabari, as quoted by Vans Kennedy. —Bombay Transactions, iii. p. 421.

<sup>5</sup> There is a curious passage in Tertullian contrasting the modesty of the Arabian women of his day with the Christian virgins, who shamelessly showed their faces. "*Judicabunt nos Arabiæ fœminæ ethnicae, quæ non caput sed faciem quoque ita totam tegunt, ut uno oculo liberato contentæ sint dipidiam frui lucem, quam totam faciem prostituere.*"—*De Virg. Vel. c. 17.*

<sup>h</sup> On the translation of these words depends the question whether Moham-

med was absolutely illiterate. Those who deny it explain the phrase as confined to that which the angel then ordered him to read.

<sup>1</sup> On the subject of Mohammed's epilepsy, consult the long note of Dr. Weil, p. 42. It is difficult to resist the evidence which he adduces. Dr. Weil concludes: "I do not think, with Theophanes, that he alleged the apparition of Gabriel to conceal his malady, but that the malady itself was the cause of his belief in these apparitions."

weary, to repose. His wife had covered him. The angel again appeared. "Arise, thou wrapped up." "Why should I arise?" "Arise and preach," said Gabriel; Mohammed's divine mission. "cleanse thy garments, and flee every abomination." Mohammed imparted to his wife his *divine mission*. "I," said Chadijah, "will be the first believer." They knelt in the appointed attitude of prayer; by the command of Gabriel they performed their ablutions. The child Ali, but seven years old, beheld them, and inquired the reason of this strange conduct. Mohammed replied, that he was the chosen prophet of God; that belief in Islam secured salvation in earth and heaven. Ali believed, and became the second of the faithful. Thus was Mohammed the prophet of his household. Slowly, however, did he win proselytes, even among his own kindred. Three years elapsed before the faith received the accession of Abubeker and of Othman, the future caliphs. Mohammed at length is accepted as the prophet of his family, of the noble and priestly house of Hashem. Abu Talib, his uncle, remains almost alone an unbeliever. And now Mohammed aspires to be the prophet of his *Tribe*.<sup>k</sup> That tribe, the Koreishite, was a kind of hierarchy, exercising religious supremacy, and the acknowledged guardians of the Caaba, the sacred stone of Mecca, with its temple. The temple of the Caaba was at once, as is usual among Oriental nations, the centre of the commerce and of the religion of Arabia. Tradition, even in the days of Mohammed thought immemorial, had associated this holy place with the names of Adam, of Seth, and of Abraham; and worshippers from all quarters, idolaters who found each his peculiar idol, the Jew and the Christian, looked with awful reverence on this mysterious spot. The pilgrim of every creed, the merchant from every part of the peninsula, met at Mecca: almost all joined in the ceremonial of visiting the sacred mountain, kissing the black stone, approaching the holy well of Zemzem, each seven times, the mystic number with Arab as with Jew; and sacrifices

<sup>k</sup> It was not till the fourth or fifth year after his own conversion that he came forth as a public preacher.— Surah xv. v. 94-99; Sale, ii. p. 75. Compare xxvi. p. 218. He preached on the hill Safa.

were offered with devout prodigality. Arabian poetry hung up its most popular songs in the temple of the Caaba. It is not clear to what peculiar form of idolatry the Koreishite adhered, whether to the primitive and Arabian worship, which had enshrined in the temple of Caaba her three hundred and sixty deities; or to the later Tsabaism, a more refined worship of the planetary bodies.<sup>m</sup> But the intractable Koreish met him with contemptuous unbelief. They resisted the new prophet with all the animosity of an established priesthood trembling for their dignity, their power, and their wealth; they dreaded the superiority which would be assumed by the family of Hashem. In that family Abu Talib, though he resisted the doctrines, protected the person of Mohammed, as did all his kindred, except the implacable Abu Lahab. Like other hierarchies the Koreish had been tolerant only so long as they were strong. The eloquence, the virtue, the charity of Mohammed only made him more dangerous; his proselytes increased; the conversion of Hamza, another of his uncles, one of the most obstinate of unbelievers, drove them to madness. A price was set upon his secret assassination, a hundred camels and a thousand ounces of silver. Omar, now twenty-six years old, undertook the deed.<sup>n</sup> He was accosted on his way by the convert Nueim. "Ere thou doest the deed," said Nueim, "look to thine own near kindred." Omar rushed to the house of his sister Fatima, to punish her apostacy: he found some sentences of the Korân, he read them, and believed. Yet the Koreishites abated not in their hostility. The life of Mohammed was a struggle to enforce his creed on an obstinate and superstitious people; of threatened martyrdom for the unity of God and for his own prophetic mission. He was at length placed under a solemn interdict by the two ruling families of the Koreishites. Some of his humbler followers fled to Abyssinia, where they were protected by the sovereign of that land. Mohammed submitted to personal insult. He

Persecution of  
Mohammed.

<sup>m</sup> The uncle of Mohammed, Abu Talib, was strenuous for the worship of two female deities, and the adoration of the "daughters of God" is reprobated in the

Korân as one of the worst, probably therefore one of the most prevalent, forms of idolatry.

<sup>n</sup> Weil, p. 59.

allowed himself to be abused, to be spit upon, to have dust thrown upon him, and to be dragged out of the temple by his own turban fastened to his neck: he beheld his followers treated with the same ignominy. At times his mind was so depressed as to need the consolations of the angel Gabriel. He constantly changed his bed to elude the midnight assassin. For three years Mohammed was under this interdict,<sup>o</sup> dwelling in a castle of his uncle Abu Talib's, situated in a deep and unassailable ravine, and came to Mecca only during the holy months. The death of Chadijah broke one of the Prophet's ties to Mecca: that of Abu Talib, who died an unbeliever, left him only the valour and vigilance of his disciples to shield him against the implacable and deepening hatred of the Koreishites. The Prophet must fly from his native city; and the hopes of making Mecca the national religious metropolis, the centre of his new spiritual empire, seemed to have failed utterly and for ever. Miracle or craft alone saved him from the hands of his enemies, who surprised him, nearly alone, in the house of Abubeker. During his flight he only escaped assassination by the faithful Ali taking his place in the tent; and, so ran the legend, when he slumbered in a cave, the spider wove its web over the entrance, and a pigeon laid two eggs to show that its solitude had been undisturbed.<sup>p</sup>

Flight.  
Hegira.

Medina (Yathrib<sup>q</sup>) at once accepted the dignity which had been spurned by Mecca. Six of her most distinguished citizens had embraced at Mecca the cause of the Prophet. The idolatry of Medina had not the local strength of that of Mecca; it had not the same strongly organised hierarchy. Some rivalry with the commercial importance of Mecca, so closely connected with her religious supremacy, entered, no doubt, into the minds of the Medinese when they thus allied themselves with the chief of the new religion. The proselytes to Islam had prepared the whole

<sup>o</sup> The interdict was suspended in the temple, according to Dr. Weil, in the seventh year of Mohammed's mission.

<sup>p</sup> Era of the Hegira or flight, April 19, 622. According to Caussin de Perceval, the true date of Mohammed's

flight from Mecca was the 18th or 19th June, 622.—iii. 17. Weil makes it 20th September. The question is, whether the intercalated year was in use at this time.

<sup>q</sup> Yathrib now took the name of Medina (the city).—C. de P. iii. 21.

city, and Mohammed did not leave Mecca till a deputation from Medina had sworn fealty to their new sovereign.<sup>r</sup> The form of the oath showed the Prophet under a new character. "If," said these Ansarii (the assistants), "we are slain in your cause, what is our reward?" "Paradise," replied the Prophet.<sup>s</sup>

In Medina appear manifest indications of more direct advances to the Jews. The Arabian Jews in the neighbourhood of the two great cities were numerous and powerful, formed whole tribes, occupied strong fortresses, and evidently, from the Talmudic character of the Korân, exercised a most extensive religious influence over the central part of Arabia. The wide-spread expectation of the Messiah among the Jews was mingled, no doubt, with the suggestive movements in the mind of Mohammed; and this fanaticism enlisted in his cause would have placed him at once at the head of a most formidable confederacy.<sup>t</sup> Jerusalem suddenly becomes the centre of the Islamite system instead of Mecca; it is the Kiblah of all prayer. The Prophet is transported to its walls. His journey, to the more refined and spiritual minds, might appear to have taken place in a heaven-sent vision; to the ruder he was described as riding bodily on the mysterious horse El Borak, and lighting from his aerial voyage on the site of the temple of Jerusalem.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>r</sup> This was the second or great oath of Acaba.—Caussin de Perceval, iii. 8.

<sup>s</sup> In the 2nd Sura, Mohammed appears to forbid all but defensive warfare: "And fight for the religion of God, against those who fight against you; but transgress not by attacking them first, for God loveth not the transgressors."—Sur. ii. p. 34. He was as yet too weak for aggressive war.

<sup>t</sup> Tabari, according to Col. Vans Kennedy, ascribes the ready acquiescence of the Medinese in the views of the Prophet to their fear lest they should be anticipated by their neighbours the Jews. On their return these men first recited the passages of the Korân which they had learned from Mohammed, and then said, "This is that Prophet whose name the Jews daily invoke, and whose coming they so anxiously expect: should they therefore receive him, and be obe-

dient to him, you will be reduced to the greatest difficulties; it is therefore expedient that you should hasten to anticipate the Jews, and receive Mohammed before they can unite with him." Compare Caussin de Perceval, iii. 8. Bombay Transact. p. 430.

<sup>u</sup> On the Kiblah, see Korân, Sur. ii. p. 26-27, with Sale's note; Abulfeda, ch. xxvi.; Geiger, p. 19. A certain Imam says, that whilst Mohammed was in Mecca, he used the Caaba as his Kiblah, but whilst in Medina he used the holy house as his Kiblah, and there also made a general change; so that one period was abrogated by another. In a certain exposition it is said that he first prayed in Mecca towards the Caaba, and then changed to the Baitu i Mahaddos, which also his followers did at Medina for their pilgrimages, or even sacred processions: but that afterwards

But the Jews repelled the overtures of the Prophet from the race of Ismael. They scoffed at his pretensions, they provoked his terrible vengeance.\* Tribe after tribe was defeated; their castle-fastnesses could not sustain the assaults of the impetuous warriors who now went forth under the banner of Islam. First the Jews of Kainoka, then those of Al Nadher, then those of Koraidha and of Khaibar were forced to submission. The remorseless massacre of the Koraidha after the great battle of the Ditch, in which Mohammed watched the slaughter of seven hundred and ninety Jews in cold blood, whom the Korân pursues to the fires of hell, shows the implacable resentment of the Prophet.<sup>†</sup> On other occasions the Prophet was not wanting in clemency; here his deliberate ruthlessness may be traced to the disappointment of high-wrought hopes.

At length, after a war of some years between the rival cities and the followers of the rival religions, after two bloody battles, that of Beder, in which the <sup>Progress of Islam.</sup> Mussulmans were victorious,<sup>‡</sup> that of Ohud, won by the Koreishites, after Medina had been twice besieged by the warriors of Mecca, and after a short truce, violated by the Koreishites, a sudden awe of Islam seized the obstinate unbelievers. In a few years an expedition, which at first bore the appearance of a peaceful pilgrimage and encountered but feeble resistance, made the Prophet master of Mecca.<sup>§</sup> The Caaba opened its unresisting gates; the three hundred and sixty idols fell without resistance on the part of their worshippers. "The truth hath come, let lies disappear." They were dashed to pieces. The Mouedhin proclaimed from the roof, "There is one God, and Mohammed is his prophet." No contumacious voice is heard

the Kiblah was transferred to the Caaba. Hist. of the Temple of Jerusalem, by Jelal Addin al Jebal, translated by F. Reynolds.—Orient. Fund Translat. p. 109. Jelal Addin is disposed to glorify the temple at Jerusalem, but there is no reason to question his citations from early Mohammedan writers. See also Weil, p. 90.

\* At different periods many Jews of note embraced Islamism: Waraka, the cousin of Chadijah, Halib ben Maleh, a Jewish prince, and Abdallah ibn Salaam.—Geiger, page 24.

\* See in 'History of the Jews,' the successive wars with these Jewish tribes, v. iii. p. 249 *et seq.* For their dates (some years intervened), compare Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii.

† See the vivid description of the battle of Beder in Caussin de Perceval, iii. 49-65; of Ohud, 89-104: in this battle Mohammed was wounded in the face, and in great danger.

‡ VIII. of the Hegira.—Caussin de Perceval, iii. p. 221, &c.

in denial. The conquest was almost without bloodshed, except that of a few from old hereditary hostility.  
 11 Jan. 630. The most powerful of the Prophet's adversaries became proselytes to the faith; the whole population swore allegiance. From that time Mecca becomes again the capital city of Islam; the divine edict in favour of Jerusalem is abrogated; the Prophet is sternly and exclusively Arabian; pilgrimages to the Caaba, now purified of its idols, become an essential part of the religion; the whole energy of Mohammedanism flows from and circulates back to the centre of the system.

Lord of Mecca, Mohammed stands supreme and alone; the Arabian mind and heart are his; the old idolatry has sunk at once before the fear of his arms and the sublimity of his new creed. He can disdain the alliance of those whom before he might stoop to conciliate; he can express hatred and contempt for the Jew and for the Christian, at least within the Arabian peninsula; he may pursue them with fierce and implacable hostility. But more than this, and herein is the great debt of gratitude which Arabia owes to Mohammed, the old hereditary feuds of the tribes and races are hushed in awe or turned into one impetuous current against the infidels. What on the whole was the influence of Mohammedanism on the world, we pause not now to inquire, or whether human happiness paid dear for the aggrandisement of the Arab race. But Arabia is now a nation; it takes its place among the nations of the earth; it threatens to become the ruling nation of the world.\*

It was the policy of Mohammed first to secure the absolute religious unity of Arabia. In Arabia Islam at once declares irreconcilable war with all forms of unbelief: they are swept away or retire into ignominious obscurity. The

\* See in Tabari, ii. 276-8; Ibn Khaldun, 194, the remarkable conversation attributed to Yezdegerd and the ambassadors of Omar: "Who are you to attack an empire? Of all the nations of the world, the poorest, most disunited, most ignorant, most stranger to the arts which are the source of power and wealth." "What you have said of our poverty, our divisions, or barbarism, was true indeed." . . . The ambassador describes their misery, their superstition,

their idolatry. "Such were we. Now we are a new people. God has raised up among us a man . . . his envoy and true prophet. Islamism, his religion, has enlightened our minds, extinguished our hatreds, made us a society of brothers under laws dictated by divine wisdom. He has said, Consummate my work; spread the empire of Islam over the whole world; the earth is the Lord's, he has bestowed it on you."

only dangerous antagonists of Mohammedanism after the death of Mohammed are rival prophets. Moseilama for a time seems to arrest or to divert the current of religious conquest. But even the religious unity of Arabia, much less that of the conquered world, dawns but by degrees upon the mind of Mohammed; his religious ambition expands with his success; his power is the measure of his intolerance; hence the strong contradictions in the Korân, the alternating tone of hatred and of tolerance, of contempt and of respect, with which are treated the authors and the votaries of other religions. He is a gentle preacher until he has unsheathed the sword:<sup>b</sup> the sword once unsheathed is the one remorseless argument. The convenient principle of abrogation annuls all those sentences of the Korân which speak in a milder tone to unbelievers.<sup>c</sup> At one time we find the broad principle of Eastern toleration explicitly avowed: the diversity of religion is ascribed to the direct ordinance, and all share in the equal favour of God.<sup>d</sup>

But the Korân gradually recants all these gentler sentences, and assumes the language of insulting superiority or undisguised aversion. Even in the Sura which contains the loftiest and most tolerant sentences, their spirit is abrogated by the repeated assertion that Jew and Christian have been alike unfaithful to their own law, and that the same disobedience which instigates them to rebel

<sup>b</sup> There is a passage in the 29th Sura (revealed at Mecca) commanding Islamites "to dispute mildly with those who receive the Scriptures." But this verse is thought to be abrogated by the chapter of the Sword.—Compare Sale *in loco*.

<sup>c</sup> This principle was early asserted in the Korân. "Whatever verse we shall abrogate or cause thee to forget, we will bring a better than it, or one like unto it."—ch. ii. p. 21.

<sup>d</sup> "Surely those who believe, and those who Judaize, and Christians and Sabæans, whoever believeth in God and the last day, and doth that which is right, they shall have their reward with their Lord; there shall come no fear on them, neither shall they be grieved."—ch. ii. p. 12. This and the parallel pas-

sage in the 5th chapter are said to be abrogated, or are explained by commentators whom Reland follows, as meaning that they will previously embrace Mohammedanism. But nothing less than abrogation can remove another passage: "Unto every one of you were given a law and an open path, and if God had pleased he had surely made you one people: but he hath thought fit to give you different laws, that he might try you in that which he hath given you respectively. Therefore strive to equal each other in good works. Unto God shall ye all return, and then will he declare unto you that concerning which ye have disagreed."—ch. v. In another place is the broad axiom, "Let there be no violence in religion."—ch. ii. p. 48.

against their own religion is the cause of their unbelief in Islam.<sup>o</sup> The Jews from the earliest ages had been the murderers of the prophets.<sup>f</sup> The murder of the prophet Jesus is among their darkest crimes.

The Korân  
becomes  
intolerant.  
To Jews.

What wonder that they now turn a deaf ear to the prophet Mohammed? They had falsified their scriptures; they had erased or perverted the predictions concerning Mohammed; they were enemies, therefore, to all true religion, and, as enemies, to be pursued with unmitigated enmity. They are guilty of a worse impiety (strange, no doubt, was the charge to their own ears), an infringement of the unity of God, which would demand the vengeance of all true believers. They hold Ezra to be the Son of God.<sup>g</sup>

Towards the Christians these early tolerant maxims of religious freedom were still further neutralised by the collision of the first principle of Mohammedanism with that of the dominant Christianity. In one milder passage the Korân intimates that the Christians were less irreconcilable enemies to the Prophet than the Jew and the idolater, and this is attributed to the influence of the priests and the monks.<sup>h</sup> The sense and the occasion of this sentence are manifest. The idolaters and Jews were in arms against the Prophet, and defending their religion with desperate valour. The only Christians with whom he had then come in contact were a peaceful people, probably monastic communities. But as its views and its conquests expand, in the Korân the worship of Christ becomes the worst impiety: the assertion of his divinity involves the guilt of infidelity.<sup>i</sup>

\* "Thou shalt surely find the most violent of all men in enmity against the true believers, to be the Jews and the idolaters."—ch. v. p. 147.

<sup>f</sup> "They dislocate the words of the Pentateuch from their places, and have forgotten part of that which they were admonished."—ch. v. p. 131.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. ix. p. 243. Sale quotes one of the commentators (Al Beidawi), who says that this imputation must be true, because it was read to the Jews and they did not contradict it.

<sup>h</sup> "Thou shalt surely find those

among them to be the most inclinable to entertain friendship for the true believers who say, 'We are Christians.' This cometh to pass because there are priests and monks among them; and because they are not elated with pride."—ch. v. vol. i. p. 147.

<sup>i</sup> "Verily Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is the apostle of God, and his word which he conveyed unto Mary, and a spirit proceeding from him. Believe, therefore, in God and his apostles, and say not there are three Gods: forbear this, it will be better for you. God is

The worshipper of the Christian Trinity denied the Unity of God, and however the contemptuous toleration of a mighty Mohammedan empire might give indulgence to such errors among the lower orders of its subjects, the vital principles of the two religions stood opposed in stubborn antagonism. The Christian would not be soothed by the almost reverential admission of Jesus into the line of heaven-commissioned prophets, or even the respectful language concerning the Virgin Mary. The Mohammedan would not endure with patience the slightest imagined impeachment on the divine Unity. The rude and simple Arab had as yet no turn to or comprehension of metaphysical subtlety : he could not, or would not, conceive the Trinity but as three Gods.

It was indeed but a popular and traditionary Judaism,<sup>k</sup> a popular and traditionary Christianity—neither the Judaism of the Law, nor the Christianity of the Gospel—which Mohammed encountered in Arabia. The Prophet may have exaggerated his own ignorance in order to heighten the great standing miracle of the faith, the composition of the exquisite and unrivalled Korân by an unlettered man.<sup>m</sup> But throughout he betrays that he has no real knowledge either of the Old or New Testament: the fables blended up with the genuine Jewish history, though Talmudic, are not drawn from that great storehouse of Jewish learning, but directly from the vulgar belief.<sup>n</sup> The Jews of Arabia had ever been held in contempt, and not without justice, by their more polished brethren of Babylon or Tiberias, as a rude and barbarous people; they had revolted back to old Arabian habits; they are said not even to be noticed in the Talmud.

The Prophet's notions of Christianity were from equally impure sources, if, as no doubt they were, drawn from the vulgar creed of the Arabian Christians. They also must have dwelt apart, as well from the more rigid orthodoxy,

but one God. Far be it from him that he should have a son. . . . Christ doth not proudly disdain to be a servant unto God: neither the angels who approach near to his presence."—ch. iv. p. 126. Passages might be multiplied from almost every Sura.

<sup>k</sup> Geiger, p. 29.

<sup>m</sup> "Thou couldst not read any book before this, neither couldst thou write it with thy right hand; then had the gainsayers justly doubted of the divine original thereof."—Sur. 29, ii. p. 250.

<sup>n</sup> See the whole account of Moses in the 2nd chapter.

as from the intellectual condition of the Church in the more civilised part of the world. They were Trinitarians, indeed, and at least almost worshippers of the Virgin Mary. They are distinctly charged with her deification.<sup>o</sup> But the spurious gospels of the Infancy<sup>p</sup> and of Barnabas<sup>q</sup> contribute far more to the Christianity shown in the Korân than the writings of the Evangelists. Their Gnostic tendencies are shown by the Docetism<sup>r</sup> or unreality of the Saviour's crucifixion, supposed by Mohammed to be the common belief of all Christians.<sup>s</sup> To monastic Christianity Islam stood even in more direct opposition. Marriage in the Korân appears to be the natural state of man.<sup>t</sup> Chastity, beyond a prudent temperance in connubial enjoyments and the abstinence from unlawful indulgences, is a virtue unknown in the Korân; it belongs neither to saints in earth nor in heaven. Even in the respect shown to the Virgin Mary she is spoken of, not under the appellation which sanctified her to Christian ears, but as the *mother* of Jesus. The Korân admits none of the first principles of monasticism, or, rather, directly repudiates them. It disdains the Pantheistic system in all its forms; the Emanation theory of India, the Dualism of Persia, the Mysticism of monkery. God stands alone in his nature, remote, unapproachable; in his power, dominant throughout all space and in all time, but divided by a deep and impassable gulf from created things. The absorption into, or even the approximation towards the Deity by contemplation in this life or perfection in the life to come, are equally foreign to the Korân. The later Sufism, which mingled this Orientalism with the religion of the Prophet, is more absolutely at variance with its original spirit, even than with that of

<sup>o</sup> "And when God shall say unto Jesus at the last day, O Jesus, son of Mary! hast thou said unto men, Take me and my mother for two Gods, beside God? he shall answer, Praise be unto thee! it is not for me to say that which I ought not."—ch. v. i. p. 156.

<sup>p</sup> See in ch. xxx, the account of the birth of Christ. It is difficult to acquit Mohammed of confounding the Virgin Mary with Miriam the Prophetess, the sister of Moses.—vol. ii. p. 133.

<sup>q</sup> These works exist in Arabic in more than one form. Compare Thilo, Codex Apoc. N. T.

<sup>r</sup> This Docetic notion was formed to favour the Gnostic (not the Catholic) view of the divinity of Christ.—Hist. of Christianity.

<sup>s</sup> See the very curious extract from Tabari, (Weil, die Chalifen, i. 103,) on the substitution of a Jewish youth for Jesus on the cross, and the ascension of Jesus to heaven.

<sup>t</sup> Mohammed was aware that the monastic system was later than Christianity. It was not ordained by God.—ch. lviii. p. 421.

the Gospel. Mohammed raised no speculative or metaphysical questions about the origin of evil: he took the world as it was, and denounced the vengeance of God against sin. To sin, angels, genii, and man were alike liable: they were to be judged at the final resurrection, and either condemned to one of the seven hells, or received into one of the seven heavens. And these seven hells and seven heavens are eternal, immutable. There is no reabsorption of the universe into the Deity. The external world and God will maintain throughout eternity the same separate, unmingling, unapproximating existence.

Such then was the new religion which demanded the submission of the world. As a sublime Monotheism entitled to disdain the vulgar Polytheism <sup>Creed of Islam.</sup> of Arabia, of the remoter East, perhaps the Fire-worship of Persia, or even the depraved forms of Judaism and Christianity—yet at the highest it was but the republication of a more comprehensive Judaism; in all other respects its movement was retrograde. The habits of the religion, if it may be so said, were those of the Old Testament, not of the New; the Arabs had hardly attained the point in civilisation at which the Jews stood in the time of the Mosaic dispensation.<sup>a</sup> Mohammedanism triumphant over the world would have established the Asiatic form of society: slavery and polygamy would have become the established usages of mankind.

Islamism recognised slavery to its fullest extent; it treats it as one of the ordinary conditions of society; none of its general principles tend even <sup>Slavery.</sup> remotely to its extinction, or, except in the general admonitions to clemency and kindness, towards its mitigation. The Korân, as the universal revelation, would have been a perpetual edict of servitude.

Polygamy was the established usage of Arabia, and Mohammed limited, perhaps, rather than enlarged its pri-

<sup>a</sup> There were some distinctive usages, which are said to have been studiously introduced in order to show aversion and contempt for the Jews.—Pocock, Not. Miscel. c. 9, p. 369; Geiger, p. 198. Of these the most important is the total abolition of the distinction of

meats, with the exception of those prohibited to the Jewish converts to Christianity—that which died a natural death, blood, swine's flesh, and meat sanctified to idols.—Korân, c. ii. p. 30, v. p. 128, vi. 181.

vilege. The number of lawful wives is fixed, and with the permission of polygamy<sup>\*</sup> are mingled some wise and humane provisions against its evils.<sup>7</sup> But as concubinage with female captives was recognised hardly with any limit, unbounded licence became the reward of brilliant valour, and the violation of women or the appropriation of all female captives to the hareem became one of the ordinary laws of war.<sup>8</sup>

The Korân was a declaration of war against mankind. The world must prepare at once for a new barbarian invasion and for its first great universal religious war. This barbarian invasion was not, like that of the Teutons, the Huns, or even the later Monguls of the North and East, wave after wave of mutually hostile tribes driving each other upon the established kingdoms of the civilised world, all loose and undisciplined; it was that of an aggregation of kindred tribes, bound together by the two strong principles of organisation, nationality and religious unity. The Arab had been trained in a terrible school. His whole life was a life of war and adventure. The Arabians were a nation of marauders, only tempered by some commercial habits; the Arab was disciplined in the severest abstemiousness and endurance; bred in utter recklessness of human life. The old romance of Antares may show that the Arabs had already some of the ruder elements of chivalry—valour which broke out in the most extraordinary paroxysms of daring, the fervid and poetic temperament, the passion for the marvellous: their old

Korân war  
against man-  
kind.

<sup>\*</sup> All other licence was forbidden. True believers keep themselves from carnal knowledge of any woman except their wives, or the captives which their right hands possess (for as to them they shall be blameless); but whoever coveteth any woman beyond these, they are transgressors.

<sup>7</sup> The laws of divorce and of prohibited degrees, &c., are chiefly from the Old Testament.—ch. ii. and iv.

<sup>8</sup> The heaven-sanctioned indulgence of Mohammed in the violation of his own laws, by which he assumed and exercised a right to fifteen or more wives (the number is not quite certain), is perhaps not unjustly charged to the unbridled lust of the Prophet. Yet ano-

ther at least concurrent cause may be suggested—the anxiety for male issue. Mohammed bitterly felt the death of his four sons by Chadijah, who died in their infancy; and that of one by Maria the Egyptian. This was not only a fatal blow to his ambition, which doubtless would have led to the foundation of an hereditary religious dynasty, but was a reproach among his people, and threw some suspicion on his pre-eminent favour with God. Al-as Ebn Wayel, who was so cruel and so daring as to insult him on the loss of his favourite boy as “caudâ mutilus,” was accursed of heaven, and a special Sura (the 108th) was revealed to console the Prophet.—Abulfeda, c. lxvii., with Gagnier’s note.

poetry displays their congeniality both with the martial life and the amatory paradise opened by the Korân to true believers.\* For to all this was now superadded the religious impulse, the religious object, the pride of religious as of civil conquest. Religious war is the duty, the glory, assures the beatitude of the true believer. The last revealed chapter, the ninth, of the Korân, the legacy of implacable animosity bequeathed to mankind, has deepened to an unmitigated intenseness of ferocity. It directs the extermination of the idolaters of Arabia; it allows them four months for submission to the belief and to the rites of Islam; after that it commands them to be massacred without mercy, and proceeds after death to inflict on them an eternity of hell-fire.<sup>b</sup> If the same remorseless extermination is not denounced against the Jew and the Christian, the true Islamite is commanded to fight against them till they are reduced to subjection and to the payment of tribute; while, to inflame the animosity of his followers, he repeats in the strongest terms what to their ears sounded not less odious than the charge of idolatry: against the Jew the worship of Ezra as the Son of God; against the Christian, not only that of Christ, but, in allusion no doubt to the worship of saints and martyrs, of their priests and monks.<sup>c</sup> The wealth of the priests and monks is temptingly suggested, and their employment of it against true religion sentenced with a particularity which might warrant the most unscrupulous seizure of such ill-bestowed treasures.<sup>d</sup> The Islamites who stood aloof, either from indolence, love of ease, or cowardice, from the holy warfare, were denounced as traitors to God: the souls of more faithful believers were purchased by God: paradise was

\* Antar, translated by Terrick Hamilton, Esq., *passim*.

<sup>b</sup> "And when the months wherein ye are not allowed to attack them are passed, kill the idolaters wherever ye shall find them, and take them prisoners, and besiege them, and lay wait for them in every convenient place."—ch. ix. p. 238. The works of these men are vain, and they shall remain.

<sup>c</sup> They take their priests and their monks for their lords, besides God and Christ the son of Mary, although they

are commanded to worship one God only.

<sup>d</sup> Dante might have borrowed some of these phrases. "In the day of judgment their treasures shall be intensely heated in the fire of hell, and their foreheads and their sides and their backs shall be stigmatised therewith; and their tormentors shall say, This is what ye have treasured up for your souls; take therefore that which ye have treasured up."—ch. ix. p. 244.

the covenanted price if they fought for the cause of God : whether they slay or be slain the promise is assuredly due. The ties of kindred were to be burst : the true believer was to war upon the infidel, whoever he might be ; the idolater was even excluded from the prayers of the faithful.\* The sacred months were not to suspend the warfare against unbelievers. Victory and martyrdom are the two excellent things set before the believer. What may be considered the dying words, the solemn bequest of Mohammed to mankind, were nearly the last words of the last-revealed Sura : " O true believers ! wage war against such of the infidels as are near you, and let them find severity in you, and know that God is with them that fear him."<sup>†</sup>

Nevertheless, the Mohammedan invasions (and this was still more appalling to mankind) were by no means the inroads of absolute savages ; not the outbursts of spoilers who wasted the neighbouring kingdoms and retired to their deserts, but those of conquerors governed by a determined policy of permanent subjugation. Not merely was the alternative of Islamism or tribute to be offered, and unbelievers beyond the bounds of Arabia allowed to capitulate on these milder terms, but even their war-law contained provisions which, while they recognised the first principles of humanity, showed that they intended to settle as masters in the conquered territories. After victory they were to abstain from indiscriminate carnage,<sup>‡</sup> from that of children, of the old, and of women ; they were to commit no useless or vindictive ravage ; to destroy no fruit or palm trees ; to respect the corn fields and the cattle. They were to adhere religiously to the faith of treaties. Their conduct to the priests or ministers of an opposite religion was more questionable and contradictory. The monks who remained peacefully in their convents were to be

\* " It is not allowed unto the Prophet, nor those who are true believers, that they pray for idolaters, although they be of them, after it is become known unto them that they are inhabitants of hell."—ch. ix. p. 252.

<sup>†</sup> Ch. ix. p. 263.

<sup>‡</sup> " When ye encounter the unbe-

lievers, strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter among them ; and bind them in bonds ; and either give them a free dismission afterwards, or exact a ransom until the war shall have laid down its arms."—ch. xlvii. ii. 376.

respected and their buildings secured from plunder. But, as if conscious of the power of fanaticism in themselves, they wisely dreaded its reaction through the despair, and it might be, heroic faith of the priesthood. Towards them the war-law speaks in a sterner tone, though even they are not excluded from the usual terms of capitulation. "Another sort of people that belong to the synagogue of Satan, that have shaven crowns, be sure you cleave their skulls and give them no quarter till they either turn Mohammedan or pay tribute."<sup>a</sup>

Mohammed himself, if we are to trust the tradition preserved by the best Arabian historians, had not only vaguely denounced war against mankind in the Korân, but contemplated, at least remotely, vast and unlimited conquests. The vision of the great Arabian empire had dawned upon his mind.<sup>1</sup> Already, even before the conquest of Mecca, he had summoned, not only the petty potentates of the neighbouring kingdoms, but the two great powers of the more civilised world, the king of Persia and the emperor of the East, to submit to his religious supremacy. His language, indeed, was courteous, and only invited them to receive the creed of Islam. If there be any foundation for this fact, which was subsequently embellished with mythic fiction, it might seem that the Prophet, either despairing of the subjugation of his intractable countrymen, had turned his mind to foreign conquest; or that he hoped to dazzle the yet hostile Arabs into his great national and religious confederacy by these magnificent pretensions to universal sovereignty. The neighbouring princes replied in very different language. The governor of Egypt, Mokawkas, treated the mission with great respect, and sent, among many valuable presents, two beautiful girls, one of whom, Mary, became a special favourite. The king of Bahrein, Mondar Ebn Sawa, embraced Islam with almost all his people. The king of Ghassan, Al Harith Ebn Ali Shawer, answered, that he would go himself to Mohammed. For this supposed menace the Prophet imprecated a curse on that kingdom. A more fearful malediction

<sup>a</sup> The instructions of Abubeker to the Syrian army, in Ockley, vol. i. p. 22.

<sup>1</sup> In the 7th year of the Hegira.

was uttered against Hawdka Ebn Ali, king of Yemen, who had apostatised back from Islamism to Christianity, and returned a contemptuous answer. The Prophet's curse was fulfilled in the speedy death of the king. The king of Persia received with indignant astonishment this invitation from an obscure Arabian adventurer to yield up the faith of his ancestors. He tore the letter and scattered the fragments. "So," said the Prophet, "shall his empire be torn to pieces."<sup>k</sup> The Mohammedan tradition of Persia still points out the scene of this impious rejection of the Prophet's advances.<sup>m</sup> The account of the reception of the Prophet's letter by the emperor Heraclius bears still stronger marks of Arabian fancy. He is said to have treated it with the utmost reverence, placed it on his pillow, and nothing but the dread of losing his crown prevented the Roman from embracing the faith of Islam. A strange but wide-spread Jewish tradition contrasts strongly with this view of the character of Heraclius. A vision had warned the emperor that the throne of Byzantium would be overthrown by a circumcised people.<sup>n</sup> So ignorant was Heraclius of any people so distinguished, but the Jews, that he commenced a violent persecution of the race, and persuaded the kings of France and Spain to join in his merciless hostility to the Israelites.

The Korân itself, the only trust-worthy authority as to the views of Mohammed, shows that he watched not without anxiety the strife which, during his own rise, was raging between the Roman and the Persian empires. He rejoiced in the unexpected discomfiture of the Persians,

<sup>k</sup> Later Arabian poetry is full of the omens and prophecies which at the birth of Mohammed foreshadowed the fall of the Persian empire. The palace of the sovereign fell, the holy fires went out, and a seer uttered a long poetic prediction concerning the final ruin of the race and empire of Chosroes.—Abulfeda, *Vit. Moham.* c. i. p. 3, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Khoosroo Purveez was encamped on the banks of the Karasoo river when he received the letter of Mohammed. He tore the letter, and threw it into the Karasoo. For this action the moderate author of the *Zeenut ul-Tuarikh* calls him a wretch, and rejoices in all his

subsequent misfortunes. These impressions still exist. "I remarked to a Persian, when encamped near the Karasoo, in 1800, that the banks were very high, which must make it difficult to apply its waters to irrigation." "It once fertilised the whole country," said the zealous Mohammedan, "but its channel shrunk with horror from its banks, when that madman, Khoosroo, threw our holy Prophet's letter into the stream; which has ever since been accursed and useless."—Malcolm's *Persia*, vol. i. p. 126.

<sup>n</sup> See *Hist. of Jews*, iii.: compare Basnage and Jost.

who under Khoosroo Purveez seemed rising to a height of power formidable to the independence of the East, and fatal to the extension of his own meditated empire. The Greeks like the Mohammedans, people of the Book, were less irreconcilably opposed to Islam than the Persians, whom they held to be rank idolaters.<sup>o</sup> Persia, when Mohammed was assuming the state of an independent prince in Medina, was the threatening and aggressive power. Syria, Jerusalem itself, had been wrested from the Roman empire; and Syria and Jerusalem were the first conquests which must pave the way for an Arabian empire. Before the death of Mohammed they had been reconquered by Heraclius, who seemed suddenly to have revived the valour and enterprise of the Roman armies. The Roman empire, therefore, was the first and only great foreign antagonist encountered by the Islamites during the life of the Prophet. The event was not promising: in the battle of Muta some of the bravest of the followers of the Prophet had fallen;<sup>p</sup> the desperate valour and artifice of Khaled, the Sword of God, and the panic of the Roman army, had with difficulty retrieved the day. The war of Tabuc, for which Mohammed made such threatening preparations, ended in failure and disappointment. The desert seemed to protect the Roman empire on this first invasion from the sons of the desert.<sup>q</sup>

<sup>o</sup> Ch. xxx. p. 253. Entitled the Greeks, or al Rum. It announces the defeat of the Greeks by the Persians, and prophesies the final victory of the Greeks.

<sup>p</sup> Abulfeda, ch. xlv.

<sup>q</sup> Abulfeda, ch. lvii.; Gagnier, l. vi. ch. xi. Gibbon describes this war with spirited brevity. Korân, 9. The Moslems were discouraged by the heat. "Hell is much hotter," said the

indignant Prophet. "Les Musulmans s'avancent vers la Syrie; tout à coup le Prophète reçoit du ciel l'ordre de faire halte. Il revient à Medinah, et la raison de ce mouvement rétrograde n'a jamais été bien expliquée."—Oelsner, Des Effets de la Religion de Mohammed, p. 43. Oelsner supposes the progress of the rival Prophet Mo-seilama to have been the cause.

## CHAPTER II.

## SUCCESSORS OF MOHAMMED.

THE death of Mohammed<sup>a</sup> appeared at first the signal for the dissolution of the great Arabian confederacy. The political and religious empire might seem to have been built on no solid foundation. The death of the Prophet could not but be a terrible blow to the faith of the believers. He had never, indeed, pretended to any exemption from the common lot of mortality. He had betrayed his suspicions that he had been poisoned by a Jewish woman. His death had nothing majestic or imposing. It was caused by a fever, and at times his mind wandered. The accounts as to his firmness or feebleness in his last hour are very discrepant. He was said, on one hand, to have edified his followers by an appeal to his own severe justice and virtue. He was prepared to redress wrong: to make restitution for any injustice committed during his life. He actually did make restitution of three drachms of silver claimed by some humble person from whom he had withheld it wrongfully. But his impatience under suffering moved the wonder, almost the contempt, of his wife Ayesha. Such weakness he had rebuked in a woman. The Prophet excused himself by declaring that God afflicted him with anguish poignant in the proportion with which he had distinguished him by glory above all mankind.<sup>b</sup> At the death of Mohammed it might seem that, the master-hand withdrawn, all would return to the former anarchy of tribal independence and of religious belief.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> June 7 or 8, 632. Compare, however, Weil, *Leben Mohammed*, 351, and *Geschichte der Chaliphen*, i. p. 2; also p. 16, and note p. 15. He ascribes to Abubeker the publication or forgery of the verses which declared the Prophet mortal. This work of Dr. Weil as summing up, with the same careful industry as in his *Life of Mohammed*,

the labours of all his predecessors, will be among my chief authorities in the few following pages.

<sup>b</sup> Price, *History of Mohammedanism*, i. p. 13.

<sup>c</sup> See on the vain attempt of the Medinese to wrest the succession from the Koreishites, Weil, i. 3.

His death, on the contrary, after but a short time, was the signal of the most absolute unity; of a concentrated force, which first controlling all the antagonistic elements of disunion in Arabia, poured forth in one unbroken torrent on the world. The great internal schism as to the succession to the caliphate, the proud inheritance of the Prophet, was avoided until Mohammedanism was strong enough to bear the division, which might have been fatal at an earlier period. The rightful heir, the heir whose succession was doubtless intended by the Prophet, and more or less distinctly declared, was set aside; and yet no dissension, at least none fatal to the progress of their arms, paralysed the counsel or divided the hearts of the Islamites. Three caliphs, Abubeker, Omar, Othman, ascended, in due order, the sacred throne, and organised the first foreign conquests of Islam. Those first foreign conquests, Syria, Persia, Egypt, part of Africa, were achieved before the fierce conflict for the caliphate between Ali and Moawija. It is impossible not to admire the singular beauty of the character of Ali. Three times on the point of ascending the throne, each time supported by a formidable host of followers, each time he was supplanted through the boldness or the intrigues of the more turbulent chieftains, each time he submitted with grace and dignity to the exclusion,<sup>d</sup> remained strenuously faithful to the cause, repressed the ambition in which he was by no means wanting, condescended to the condition and zealously discharged the duties of a loyal subject. This he did though the nearest male relation of the Prophet, the son of his uncle, and the husband of a violent woman, the Prophet's daughter, the father of sons who might have looked forward to the great inheritance.<sup>e</sup> The tragedy of the death of these sons casts back even a more powerful interest on the gentle but valiant Ali.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>d</sup> Dr. Weil seems to think not so willingly, on the first submission, i. p. 6; on the last, p. 153-155. Ali, by general tradition, is exculpated from all share in the murder of Othman. Dr. Weil is throughout very unfavourable to Ali.

<sup>e</sup> Ali, during the lifetime of Fatima

the Prophetess, took no second wife: he had altogether fifteen sons and eighteen daughters.—Weil, p. 253.

<sup>f</sup> Hasan and Hussein. Dr. Weil, pitilessly critical, is dead to all the pathetic circumstances of the death of Hussein. Even Tabari's striking account he throws into a note.—p. 317.

Never was disunion so perilous to the cause of Mohammedanism; never would a contested succession have produced such disastrous consequences. The dangerous swarm of rival prophets were multiplying in different parts of Arabia; it required the collective force of Islam to crush them; but they fell before the arms and the authority of the caliphs. Moseilama, the most formidable of all, whose extraordinary influence, subtlety, and valour, seemed at one time to balance the rising fortunes of Mohammedanism, to render it doubtful under the banner of which religion, that of Moseilama or of Mohammed, would go forth the great Arab invasion of the civilised world, lost at length his power and his life before the Sword of God, the intrepid Khaled.<sup>a</sup> The effect of this, no doubt, was not merely to suppress these hostile sects, but to centre the enthusiasm, which was now burning in diverging lines, into one fiery torrent; to crowd the ranks of Islam with new warriors, who had joined it rather from the restless love of enterprise than from any strong conviction as to the relative truth of either creed, and were ready to transfer their allegiance, as success and glory were the only true tests of the divine favour, to the triumphant cause. They became at once earnest and zealous proselytes to a religion which actually bestowed such higher successes upon earth, and promised rewards, guaranteed by such successes, in the life to come. Soldiers, marauders by birth and habit, they had become followers of either prophet by the accidents of local or tribal connexion, by the excitement of the imagination and the passion of sect. Their religion was a war-cry, and so that it led to conquest they cared little what name it might sound.<sup>b</sup>

That war-cry was now raised against all who refused faith or tribute to the creed and to the armies of the Caliph. The first complete foreign conquest of Mohammedanism was Syria, the birthplace of Christianity. Palestine, the hallowed scene of the Saviour's life and death,

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Weil treats the intrigue of Moseilama with the Prophetess Ladjah and the obscene verses quoted with such coarse zest by Gibbon, as fictions of the Mussulman. Moseilama was then

100, if not 150, years old. I confess the latter sounds to me most like fiction.

—On Moseilama, pp. 21–26.

<sup>b</sup> For the wars of Khaled in Persia under Abubeker, see Weil, 31 *et seq.*

was wrested by two great battles,<sup>1</sup> and by the sieges of a few great cities, Bosra, Damascus, and Jerusalem, from the domain of Christendom. It was an easy conquest, fearfully dispiriting to the enemies of Islam, to the believers the more intoxicating, as revealing their irresistible might: the more it baffled calculation the more it appalled the defeated, and made those who found themselves invincible invincible indeed. On the one side had at first appeared numbers, discipline, generalship, tactics, arms, military engines, the fortifications of cities; on the other, only the first burst of valour, which from its very ignorance despised those advantages. The effete courage of the Roman legionaries had been strengthened by the admission of barbarians into their ranks; and the adventurous campaigns of Heraclius against the Persians had shown that the old intrepidity of the Roman armies was not quite worn out, and under a daring and skilful general might still be aggressive as well as defensive. But now the Emperor and the armies seem alike paralysed by the suddenness and impetuosity of the Arab movements. The Emperor stands aloof and does not head his armies. The armies melt away before the uncontrollable onset of the new enemies. At Ajdnadein and at Jarmuk the slaughter of the Roman armies was counted by tens of thousands, that of the Mohammedans hardly by hundreds. But it was the religious impulse which made the inequality of the contest. Religious warfare had not yet become a Christian duty; it atoned for no former criminality of life; it had no promise of immediate reward; it opened not instantaneously the gate of heaven. The religious feeling might blend itself with patriotism and domestic love. The Christian might ardently desire to defend the altar of his God, as well as the freedom of his country, and the sanctity of his household hearth. But, even if the days of heroic martyrdom were not gone by, the martyrs whose memory he worshipped had been distinguished by passive endurance rather than active valour.

<sup>1</sup> Ajdnadein, July 30, 634.—Weil, p. 46, note. Jarmuk, after the death of Abubeker, August 22, 634.—Weil, 46, probably the following day, Aug. 23.

The human sublimity of the Saviour's character consisted in his suffering. According to the monastic view of Christianity, the total abandonment of the world, with all its ties and duties, as well as its treasures, its enjoyments, and objects of ambition, advanced rather than diminished the hopes of salvation. Why should they fight for a perishing world from which it was better to be estranged? They were more highly purified by suffering persecution than by triumphing over their adversaries. It is singular, indeed, that while we have seen the Eastern monks turned into fierce undisciplined soldiers, perilling their own lives and shedding the blood of others without remorse, in assertion of some shadowy shade of orthodox expression, hardly anywhere do we find them asserting their liberties or their religion with intrepid resistance. Hatred of heresy was a more stirring motive than the dread or the danger of Islamism. After the first defeats the Christian mind was still further prostrated by the common notion that the invasion of the Arabs was a just and heaven-commissioned visitation for their sins; submission was humble acquiescence in the will of God; resistance a vain, almost an impious, struggle to avert inevitable punishment. God was against them; hereafter he might be propitiated by their sufferings, but now (such their gloomy predestinarianism) they were doomed to drink the lees of humiliation.

On the other hand, the young fanaticism of the Mussulman was constantly fed by immediate promises and immediate terrors. He saw hell with its fires blazing behind him if he fled, paradise opening before him if he fell.\* The predestined was but fulfilling his fate, accomplishing the unalterable will of God, whether in death or victory. God's immutable decree was the guardian of his unassailable life, or had already appointed his inevitable death. The battle-cry of Khaled, the Sword of God, was "Fight, fight! Paradise! Paradise!" "Methinks" (cried the youthful cousin of Khaled in the heat of battle) "I see

\* The exhortation of the generals the devil and hell-fire in your rear."—  
was brief and forcible (at the battle of Gibbon, c. xli. ix. 405.  
Jarmuk): "Paradise is before you;

the black-eyed girls looking upon me, one of whom, if she should appear in this world all mankind would die for the love of her. And I see in the hand of one of them a handkerchief of green silk, and a cap made of precious stones, and she beckons me, and calls out, Come hither quickly, I love thee!"<sup>m</sup> Contrast this as a motive to the heart of a ruder, a grosser race, with the Christian's calm, vague, trembling anticipations of a beatitude, of which that which was most definite was exemption from the sorrows and sins of life, the companionship of saints and martyrs, or even of the Redeemer himself; or perhaps some indistinct vision of angelic presence, sweet and solemn, but unimpassioned music, a wilderness of dazzling light.

But Christianity did not even offer a stubborn passive resistance.<sup>n</sup> The great cities, which, in the utter inexperience of the Arabs in the art of siege, might have been expected to be inexpugnable, except by famine, fell one after another; Bosra, Damascus, Jerusalem became Mohammedan. The first great conquest, before either of the decisive battles which lost Syria, showed that the religion as well as the arms of Islam was formidable to Christendom. The strong city of Bosra fell not merely by an act of treachery, but of apostacy, and that in no less a person than the governor, the base Romanus. In the face of the people, thus reduced to the yoke of the Saracens, the unblushing renegade owned his treason. He reproached the Christians as enemies of God, because enemies of his apostle; he disclaimed all connexion with his Christian brethren in this world or the next, and he pronounced his new creed with ostentatious distinctness. "I choose God for my Lord, Mohammedanism for my religion, the temple of Mecca for the place of my worship, the Mussulmans for my brethren, and Mohammed for my prophet and apostle."

Feeble  
resistance of  
Christianity.

<sup>m</sup> Ockley, i. p. 267.

<sup>n</sup> The complete conquest of Syria occupied about five years.—Weil, i. 82. Abubeker's instructions to the first army which invaded Christian Syria were in these terms: "Fight valiantly. . . . Mutilate not the vanquished; slay not old men, women, or children; destroy not palm-trees; burn not fruit-

trees; kill not cattle, but for food. You will find men in solitude and meditation, devoted to God; do them no harm. You will find others with their heads tonsured, and a lock of hair upon their shaven crowns; them smite with your sabres, and give them no quarter." —Caussin de Perceval, iii. 343.

At Damascus the valiant Thomas, who had assumed the command of the city, attempted to encounter the fanaticism of the Mussulmans by awakening as strong fanaticism on his own side. The crucifix was erected at the gate from which Thomas issued forth to charge the enemy. The bishop with his clergy stood around, the New Testament was placed near the crucifix. Thomas placed his hand on the book of peace and love, and solemnly appealed to Heaven to decide the truth of the conflicting religions. "O God, if our religion be true, deliver us not into the hands of our enemies, but overthrow the oppressor. O God, succour those which profess the truth and are in the right way." The prayer was interpreted by the apostate Romanus to Serjabil, the Mohammedan general. "Thou liest, thou enemy of God; for Jesus is of no more account with God than Adam. He created him out of the dust, and made him a living man, walking upon the earth, and afterwards raised him to heaven." But Christianity in the East was not yet a rival Mohammedanism; it required that admixture of the Teutonic character, which formed chivalry, to combat on equal terms with the warriors of the Korân. Latin Christianity alone could be the antagonist of the new faith. The romantic adventure of Jonas the Damascene, who to save his life abandoned his religion, in his blind passion led the conquering Moslems in pursuit of the fugitives from Damascus, and was astonished that his beloved Eudocia spurned with contempt the hand of a renegade, may suggest that Christianity had no very strong hold on many of the bravest of the Roman soldiers.<sup>p</sup>

The capitulation of Jerusalem shows the terms imposed by the conqueror on his subjects who refused to embrace Islamism, the degraded state to which the Christians sank at once under the Mohammedan empire. The characteristic summons of the city was addressed to the chief commanders and inhabitants of Ælia. If they admitted at once the unity of God, that Mohammed

<sup>p</sup> Ockley, i. 87.

<sup>p</sup> This story, the subject of Hughes's *Siege of Damascus*, is told at length by

Ockley and Gibbon: Dr. Weil treats it as fiction.

was the Prophet of God, and the resurrection and the last judgment, then it would be unlawful for the Mohammedans to shed their blood or violate their property. The alternative was tribute or submission; "otherwise I shall bring men against you who love death better than you do the drinking of wine or eating hog's-flesh."<sup>1</sup> He declared that he would not leave the walls till he had slain the garrison and made slaves of the people. During four months Jerusalem held out in gallant resistance; even then it refused to surrender but to the Caliph in person. The sternly frugal Omar arrived before the walls. On the part of the Romans the negotiation was conducted by the Bishop Sophronius; and Sophronius was constrained to submit to the humiliating function of showing the Holy Places of the city to the new Lord of Jerusalem; to point out the site of the temple in order that the Caliph might erect there his stately mosque for the worship of Islam. In the secret bitterness of his heart the bishop said, "Now indeed is the abomination of desolation in the holy of holies."

By the terms of the treaty the Christians sank at once to an inferior and subject people,<sup>2</sup> Christianity to a religion permitted to exist by the haughty <sup>Treaty of capitulation.</sup> disdain of the conqueror; it submitted to the ignominy of toleration. Christianity was to withdraw from the public gaze, to conceal itself in its own modest sanctuary, no longer to dazzle the general mind by the pomp of its processions or the solemnity of its services.<sup>3</sup> The sight of the devout Mussulman was not to be offended by the symbols of the faith; the cross was no longer to be exhibited on the outside of the churches. The bells were to

<sup>1</sup> Ockley, from the author of the History of the Holy Land.

<sup>2</sup> The Arabian traditions mention various artifices of Sophronius to divert Omar from the real holy place, but its true site had been described by the Prophet to Omar. The Prophet had seen it, as will be remembered, in his mysterious journey. One curious account states that Omar crept on his hands and knees till he came to the great sewer. He then stood upright, and proclaimed it to be the place

described by the Prophet.—Hist. of Temple of Jerusalem, p. 176.

<sup>3</sup> The capitulation is in the History of the Temple, above cited. It is quoted from the work of Abderrahman Ibn Tamin. It pretends that these were terms submitted of their own accord by the Christians, but the language of the conquering Mussulman is too manifest.

<sup>4</sup> They were not publicly to exhibit the associating religion, that is, which associated other gods with the one God.

be silent; the torches no longer to glitter along the streets. The Christians were to wail their dead in secrecy; they were, at the same time, though their ceremonies were not to be insulted by profane interruption, not to enjoy the full privilege of privacy. Their churches were at all times to be open, if the Mussulman should choose to enter; but to attempt to convert the Mussulman was a crime. They were interdicted from teaching their children the Korân, lest, no doubt, it should be profaned by their irreverent mockery; even the holy language (the Arabic) was prohibited: they were not to write or engrave their signet-rings with Arabic letters.

The monasteries were allowed to remain, and the Mussulman exacted the same hospitality within those hallowed walls which was wont to be offered to the Christian. The monks were to lodge the wayfaring Mussulman, as other pilgrims, for three nights and give him food. No spy was to be concealed in church or monastery.

The whole people was degraded into a marked and abject caste. Everywhere they were to honour the Mussulmans, and give place before them. They were to wear a different dress; not to presume to the turban, the slipper, or girdle, or the parting of the hair. They were to ride on lowly beasts, with saddles not of the military shape. The weapons of war were proscribed, the sword, the bow, and the club. If at any time they carried a sword, it was not to be suspended from the girdle. Their foreheads were to be shaved, their dress girt up, but not with a broad girdle. They were not to call themselves by Mussulman names; nor were they to corrupt the abstemious Islamite by selling wine; nor possess any slave who had been honoured by the familiarity of a Mussulman. Omar added a clause to protect the sanctity of the Mussulman's person, it was a crime in a Christian to strike a Mussulman.

Such was the condition to which the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem fell at once; nearly the same terms, no doubt, were enforced on all the Christians of Syria. For neither Antioch nor Aleppo, nor any of the other great towns, made any vigorous or lasting resistance. The Em-

peror Heraclius withdrew his troops, and abandoned the hopeless contest. Syria, from a province of the Roman empire, became a province of Islamism, undisturbed by any serious aggression of the Christians till the time of the Crusades.

The Christian historian is not called upon to describe the Mohammedan conquest of Persia. The religion of the fire-worshippers, and the throne of the Sassanian dynasty, occupied the arms of the Mohammedans less than twenty years. Yezdegird, the last of the Sassanians, perished in his flight by an ignoble hand. The Caliph was master of all the wealth, the territory, and the power of that Persian kingdom which had so long contested the East with the Byzantine empire.

Conquest of Persia.

From 632 to 651.

At the same time the tide of conquest was flowing westward with slower but as irresistible force.<sup>u</sup>

Of Egypt.

In less than three years the Saracens were masters of Egypt. Egypt fell an easy prey, betrayed by the internal hostility of the conflicting Christian sects. The Monophysite religious controversy had become a distinction not of sect only but of race. The native Egyptian population, the Copts, were stern Monophysites; the Greeks, especially those of Alexandria, adhered to the Council of Chalcedon. Mokawkas, by his name a native Egyptian, had attained to great power and influence; he is called Governor of Egypt under Heraclius. Mokawkas, according to the tradition, had been among the potentates summoned by Mohammed himself to receive the doctrine of Islam. He had returned a courteous refusal, accompanied with honourable gifts. Now, on the principle that religious hatred is more intense against those who differ the least in opinion, Mokawkas and the whole Coptic population, perhaps groaning under some immediate tyranny, preferred to the rule of those who asserted two natures in Christ, that of those who altogether denied his divinity. They acquiesced at once in the dominion of Amrou; they rejoiced when the proud Greek city of

<sup>u</sup> The invasion of Amrou is dated June, 638; the capture of Alexandria, December 22, A.D. 640 (641, Weil).

Alexandria, the seat of the tyrannical patriarch, who would enforce upon them the creed of Chalcedon, fell before his arms; they were only indignant that the contemptuous toleration of the Mohammedans was extended as well to those who believed in the two natures, as to those who adhered to the Monophysitic creed.\*

The complete subjugation of Africa was less rapid; it was half a century before the fall of Carthage. Of Africa.  
647 to 698. The commencement of the eighth century saw the Mohammedans masters of the largest and most fertile part of Spain. Latin Christianity has lost the country of Cyprian and Augustine; the number of extinguished bishoprics is almost countless.

The splendour of these triumphs of the Mohammedan arms has obscured the progress of the Mohammedan religion. In far less than a century, not only has the Caliph become the sovereign, but Islamism the dominant faith in Persia, Syria, Egypt, Africa, and part of Spain.† But how did the religion, though that of the ruling power, become that of the subject people? In Arabia alone the Korân had demanded the absolute extirpation of all rival modes of belief, of Judaism and Christianity, as well as of the older idolatries. Though vestiges both of Judaism and Christianity might remain, to Omar is attributed the glory of having fulfilled the Prophet's injunctions. But the earlier conquests do not seem, like those of a later period, that of the Ghaznevîdes in India, and of the Turks in Europe, the superinduction of an armed aristocracy in numbers comparatively small; of a new and dominant caste into an old society, which in the one case remained Brahminical or Buddhist, in the other Christian; Mohammedanism in most of the conquered countries becomes the religion of the people. In Persia the triumph of the religion was as complete as that of the arms. The faithful worshippers of fire, the hierarchy of Zoroaster, dwindled away, and retired either into the bordering and more inaccessible districts, or into India. On the south of the Caspian, on Mount Elbourz, the sacred

Progress of  
Mohammed-  
anism.

\* Compare Weil, p. 105-114.

† Ockley, vol. i. p. 318.

fire continued to burn in solitary splendour, after it had been extinguished or had expired on the countless temples, which, under the Sassanian dynasty, had arisen from the Tigris nearly to the Indus; the sacred books of Zoroaster, or at least those of the revived Zoroastrianism under Ardeschir Babhegan, were preserved by the faithful communities, who found an hospitable reception in India. Soon after the conquest the followers of Magianism seem to have become so little dangerous, that the Caliphs gave them the privilege of the same toleration as to the Christians and Jews; they became what the Korân denied them to be, a third people of the Book. The formation of a new national language, the modern Persian, from the admixture of the old native tongue with the Arabic, shows the complete incorporation of the two races, who have ever since remained Mohammedan. But in the countries wrested from Christianity the case was different. With the remarkable exception of Northern Africa, perhaps of Southern Spain, Christianity, though in degradation and subjection, never ceased to exist. There was no complete change wrought like the slow yet total extinction of Paganism in the Roman world by Christianity. In all the Christian countries, in Syria, and other parts of Asia, and in Egypt, of the three fearful alternatives offered by the Arabian invader — Islam, the sword, or tribute — the Christians, after a vain appeal to the sword, had quietly acquiesced in the humiliating tribute. They had capitulated on the payment of a regular poll-tax, and that not a very heavy one, imposed on the believers in every religion but that of the Korân. So the Nestorian and Jacobite Christians in Persia and Syria, the Copts in Egypt, and a few waning communities for a certain time even in Africa, maintained their worship. Still the relative numbers of the Mohammedans increased with great rapidity. But as for the achievement of these immense conquests, spread over so vast a surface, the Arabian armies must have been very inconsiderable (little confidence can be placed in the statement of numbers in Oriental writers), so also looking, in a general way, to the population of Arabia, and supposing that the enthusiasm of conquest and religion swept away

a very large part of it in these armed migrations to foreign lands, they must still have borne but a small proportion to the conquered races. In most countries the Arabic language became not merely that of the state, but of the people.

Our information is singularly deficient as to this silent revolution in the Christian part of the Mohammedan conquests. We have seen, though not so distinctly, perhaps, as we might wish, primitive Christianity, gradually impregnating the mind and heart of the Roman world; the infant communities are found settling in all the great cities, and gradually absorbing into themselves a large portion of the people; minds of all orders, orators, philosophers, statesmen, at length emperors, surrender to the steady aggression of the Gospel; in some cases may be traced the struggles of old religious belief, the pangs and throes of the spiritual regeneration; we know the arguments which persuaded, the impulses which moved, the hopes and fears which achieved, the religious victory.

But the moral causes, and moral causes there must have been, for the triumph of Islamism, are altogether  
Causes  
obscure. obscure and conjectural. Egypt has shown how the mutual hostility of the Christians advanced the progress of the Mohammedan arms; it is too probable that it advanced likewise the progress of the Mohammedan faith. What was the state of the Christian world in the provinces exposed to the first invasion of Mohammedanism? Sect opposed to sect, clergy wrangling with clergy, upon the most abstruse and metaphysical points of doctrine. The orthodox, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Jacobites, were persecuting each other with unexhausted animosity; and it is not judging too severely the evils of religious controversy to suppose that many would rejoice in the degradation of their adversaries under the yoke of the unbeliever, rather than make common cause with them in defence of their common Christianity. In how many must this incessant disputation have shaken the foundations of their faith! It had been wonderful if thousands had not, in their weariness and perplexity, sought refuge from these interminable and implacable controversies in the simple, intelligible truth of the Divine

Unity, though purchased by the acknowledgment of the prophetic mission of Mohammed.

Mohammed, when he sanctioned one of the old Arabian usages, Polygamy, foresaw not how powerful an instrument this would be for the dissemination of <sup>Effects of</sup> polygamy. his religion. This usage he limited, indeed, in the Korân, but claimed a privilege in himself of extending to the utmost. His successors, and most of the more wealthy and powerful Mohammedans, assumed the privilege, and followed the example of the Prophet, if not in direct violation, by a convenient interpretation of the Law.

Polygamy, on the whole, is justly considered as unfavourable to population, but while it diminishes in one class, it may proportionately tend to rapid and continual increase in another. The crowding together of numerous females in one hareem, unless they are imported from foreign countries, since the number of male and female births are nearly equal, must withdraw them from the lower and poorer classes. While then the wealthy and the powerful would have very large families, the poor would be condemned to sterile celibacy, to promiscuous concubinage, or worse. In this relation stood the Christian to the Mohammedan population. There can be no doubt that the Christian females were drawn off in great numbers by violence, by seduction, by all the means at the command of the conqueror, of the master, of the purchaser, into the hareems of the Islamites. Among the earliest questions suggested to the Caliph by the chiefs of the Syrian army, was the lawfulness of intermarriage with Grecian women, which had been prohibited by the severe Abu Obeidah. The more indulgent Caliph Omar, though himself the most abstemious of men, admitted the full right of the brave Mohammedans to those enjoyments which they had won by their valour. Those who had no families in Arabia, might marry in Syria; and might purchase female slaves to the utmost of their desires and of their abilities.\* The Christian, on the other hand, confined by his religion to one wife, often too degraded or too poor to desire or to maintain one; with a strong

\* Ockley, i. 275.

and melancholy sense of the insecurity of his household ; perhaps with the monastic feeling, already so deeply impressed on many minds, now strengthened by such dismal calamities, might, if of a better class, shrink from being the parent of a race of slaves ; or impose upon himself as a virtue that continence which was almost a necessity.

But all the children of Christian women by Mohammedans, even if the mothers should have remained faithful to the Gospel, would, of course, be brought up as Mohammedans ; and thus, in the fresh and vigorous days of the early Arabian conquerors, before the hareem had produced its inevitable eventual effects, effeminacy, feebleness, premature exhaustion, and domestic jealousies, polygamy would be constantly swelling the number of the Mohammedan aristocracy, while the Christians were wasting away in numbers, as in wealth and position. Nor would it be the higher ranks of the conquerors alone which would be thus intercepting, as it were, the natural growth of the Christian population, and turning it into Mohammedan. The Arab invasions were not, like the Teutonic, the migrations of tribes and nations, but the inroad of armies. Some might return to their families in Arabia ; a few, when settled in foreign lands, might be joined by their household ; but by far the larger number of the warriors, whether married or unmarried, would assert the privilege of conquest sanctioned by the Korân, and by the Caliph, the expounder of the Korân. As long as there were women, the hot Arab would not repress his authorized passions ; he would not wait for Paradise to reward his toils. The females would be the possession of the strongest ; and he would not permit his offspring, even if the mother should be a fervent Christian, and retain influence over her child (in most cases she would probably be indifferent, if not a convert), to inherit the degradation of an inferior caste, but would assert for him all the rights of Israemish descent. It would be difficult to calculate the effect of this constant propagation of one race, and diminution of the other, even in a few generations.

So grew the Mohammedan empire into a multitude of Mohammedan nations, owning, notwithstanding contested

successions, at least a remote allegiance to the Caliph, the heir and representative of the Prophet, but with their religious far more formidable to Christendom than their political unity. Christendom was not only assailed in front, and on its more immediate borders, not only reduced to but a precarious and narrow footing in Asia, endangered, so soon as the Arabs became a naval as well as a military power, along the whole of the Mediterranean, in all its islands and on all its coasts, but it was flanked, as it were, by the Mohammedans of Spain, who crossed the Pyrenees, and penetrated into the very heart of the Frankish empire.

Extent of  
Moham-  
medan con-  
quests.

But the most important consequence of the outburst of Mohammedanism in the history of the world and of Christianity was its inevitable transmutation of Christianity into a religion of war, at first defensive, afterwards, during the Crusades, aggressive. Religious wars, strictly speaking, were as yet unknown. Christian nations had mingled in strife, religious animosities had embittered, or even been a pretext for wars between the Arian Goths or Vandals, and the Trinitarian Romans or Franks. Local persecutions, as among the Donatists of Africa, had been enforced and repelled by arms; perhaps in some instances bishops, in defence of their native country, had at least directed military operations. In ancient history the gods of conflicting nations had joined in the contest. But the world had not yet witnessed wars of which religion was the avowed and ostensible motive, the object of conquest the propagation of an adverse faith, the penalty of defeat the oppression, if not the extirpation, of a national creed. The appearance of the Crescent or of the Cross, not so much over the fortresses or citadels, as over the temples of God, the churches, or the mosques, was the conclusive sign of the victory of Christian or Islamite. Hence sprung the religious element in Christian chivalry; and happily, or rather mercifully was it ordained for the destinies of mankind in which Christianity and Christian civilisation were hereafter to resume, or, more properly, to attain their slow preponderance, it may be hoped, their complete and final triumph, that the ruder barbarian

Religious  
consequences.

virtues, strength, energy, courage, endurance, enterprise, had been infused into the worn-out and decrepit Roman empire; that kings of Teutonic descent, Franks, Germans, Normans, had inherited the dominions of the Western empire, and made, in some respects, until the late conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, common cause with the Christian East. Christendom thus assailed along its whole frontier, and threatened in its very centre, in Rome itself, and even in Gaul, was compelled to emblazon the Cross on its banner, and to heighten all the impulses of freedom and patriotism by the still stronger passion of religious enthusiasm. Christianity had subdued the world by peace, she could only defend it by war. However foreign then and adverse to her genuine spirit; however it might tend to promote the worst and most anti-Christian vices, cruelty, licentiousness, pride, hatred; however to establish brute force as the rule and law of society; however the very virtues of such a period might harmonize but doubtfully with the Gospel; it was an ordeal through which it must pass; the Church must become militant in its popular and secular sense; it must protect its altars, its temples, its Gospel itself by other arms than those of patient endurance, mild persuasion, resigned and submissive martyrdom.

The change was as complete as inevitable. Christianity in its turn began to make reprisals by the Mohammedan apostleship of fire and sword. The noblest and most earnest believers might seem to have read the Korân rather than the Gospel; the faith of Christ or the sword is the battle-word of Charlemagne against the Saxons; the Pope preaches the Crusades; and St. Louis devoutly believes that he is hewing his way to heaven through the bleeding ranks of the Saracens.

Nor indeed, in some other respects, was Mohammedanism altogether an unworthy antagonist of Christianity. Not less rapid and wonderful than the expansion of the Mohammedan empire, and the religion of Islam, was the growth of Mohammedan civilisation—that civilisation the highest, it should seem, attainable by the Asiatic type of mankind. Starting above six centuries

Christianity  
warlike.

Mohammedan  
civilisation.

later, it has nearly reached its height long before Christianity. The barbarous Bedouins are become magnificent monarchs; in Damascus, in Bagdad, in Samarcand, in Cairo, in Cairoan, in Fez, in Seville, and in Cordova, the arts of peace are cultivated with splendour and success. The East had probably never beheld courts more polished than that of Haroun al Raschid; Cairo, in some points at least, rivalled Alexandria; Africa had not yet become a coast of pirates; in Spain cultivation had never been carried to such perfection; Andalusia has never recovered the expulsion of the Moors. In most of the Mohammedan cities the mosques were probably, in grandeur and decoration (as far as severe Islamism would allow), as rich as the Christian cathedrals of those times. Letters, especially poetry, were objects of proud patronage by the more enlightened caliphs; the sciences began to be introduced from Greece, perhaps from India. Europe recovered the astronomy of Alexandria, even much of the science of Aristotle, from Arabic sources. Commerce led her caravans through the whole range of the Mohammedan dominions; the products of India found their way to the court of Cordova. Mohammedanism might seem in danger of decay, from the progress of its own unwarlike magnificence and luxury. But it was constantly finding on its borders, or within its territories, new fierce and often wandering tribes; new Arabs, as it were, who revived all its old adventurous spirit, embraced Islamism with all the fervour of proselytes, and either filled its thrones with young dynasties of valiant and ambitious kings, or propagated its empire into new regions. The Affghans overran India, and established the great empire of the Ghaznevides; the Turks, race after race, Seljukians and Osmanlies, seized, as it were, the falling crescent, and, rivalling in fanaticism the earliest believers, perpetuated the propagation of the faith.

The expansion of Islamism itself, the enlargement of her stern and narrow creed, is even more extraordinary. The human mind, urged into active and vigorous movement, cannot be restrained within close and jealous limits. The Korân submits to a transmutation more complete than the

Gospel under the influences of Asiatic Gnosticism and Greek philosophy. Metaphysical theology, if it does not tamper with the unity of God, discusses his being and attributes. The rigid predestinarianism is softened away, if not among the soldiery, in the speculative schools. The sublime, unapproachable Deity is approached, embraced, mingled with, by the Divine Love of the Sufi. Monachism enslaves the Mohammedan, as it had the Christian mind. The dervish rivals the Christian anchorite, as the Christian anchorite the Jewish Essene or the Indian Faquir.

---

## CHAPTER III.

## CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.

CHRISTIANITY had thus lost the greater part of her dominion in two continents. Almost the whole of Asia had settled down under what might seem a more congenial form of civil and religious despotism; it became again Asiatic in all its public and social system. Northern Africa was doomed to exchange her Roman and Christian civilisation for Arabic religion, manners, and language, which by degrees, after some centuries, partly by the fanatic and more rude Mohammedanism of the savage native races, the Berbers and others, sank back into utter barbarism. In Europe, in the meantime, Christianity was still making large acquisitions, laying the foundations of that great federation of Christian kingdoms, which by their hostility, as well as their intercourse, were to act upon each other, until at length that political and balanced system should arise, out of which and by means of which, our smaller continent was to take the lead in the fuller development of humanity; and Christian Europe rise to an height of intellectual and social culture, unexampled in the history of mankind, and not yet, perhaps, at its full and perfect growth. For it was Christianity alone which maintained some kind of combination among the crumbling fragments of the Roman empire. If the Barbaric kingdoms had two associating elements, their common Teutonic descent and their common religion, far the weaker was the kindred and affinity of race; their native independence was constantly breaking up that affinity into separate, and, ere long, hostile tribes; no established right of primogeniture controlled the perpetual severance of every realm, at each succession, into new lines of kings. Thus Christianity alone was a bond of union, strong and enduring. The Teutonic kingdoms acknowledged their allegiance to the

ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome; Rome was the centre and capital of Western Christendom.

Western Christendom was still aggressive; its first effort was to reclaim Britain, which had been almost entirely lost to pagan barbarism; and next advancing beyond the uncertain boundary of the old Roman empire, to plant all along the Rhine, and far beyond, among the yet unfelled forests, and untilled morasses of Germany, settlements which gradually grew up into great and wealthy cities. Slowly, indeed, but constantly in advance, after the repulse of the Saracenic invasion by Charles Martel, Christianity remained, if not undisputed, yet the actual sovereign of all Europe, with the exception of the Mauro-Spanish kingdom and some of the Mediterranean islands, and so compensated by its conquests in the North for its losses in the East and South: till many centuries later, a new Asiatic race, the Seljukian Turks, a new outburst, as it were, with much of the original religious fanaticism, precipitated itself upon Europe, and added the narrow remnant of the Greek empire to Islamism and Asiatic influence.

Britain was the only country in which the conquest by the Northern barbarians had been followed by the extinction of Christianity. Nothing certain is known concerning the first promulgation of the Gospel in Roman Britain. The apostolic establishment by St. Paul has not the slightest historical ground; and considering the state of the island, a state of fierce and perpetual war between the advancing Roman conquerors and the savage natives, may be dismissed as nearly impossible. The Roman legionary on active service; the painted Briton, in stern resistance to the Roman, and under his Druidical hierarchy, would offer few proselytes, even to an apostle. The conversion of King Lucius is a legend. There can be no doubt that conquered and half-civilised Britain, like the rest of the Roman empire, gradually received, during the second and third centuries, the faith of Christ. The depth of her Christian cultivation appears from her fertility in saints and in heretics. St. Helena, the mother of Constantine, probably imbibed the first

Conquests of  
Western  
Christianity.

Christianity  
in Britain.

fervour of those Christian feelings, which wrought so powerfully on the Christianity of the age, in her native Britain. St. Alban, from his name and from his martyrdom, which there seems no reason to doubt, was probably a Roman soldier.\* Our legendary annals are full of other holy names; while Pelagius, and probably his companion Celestine, have given a less favourable celebrity to the British Church.<sup>b</sup>

But all were swept away, the worshippers of the saints, and the followers of the heretics, by the Teutonic conquest. The German races which overran the island came from a remote quarter yet unpenetrated by the missionaries of the Gospel. The Goths, who formed three kingdoms in Italy, Spain, and Southern France, were already Christians; the Lombards partially converted; even among the Franks, Christianity was known, and perhaps had some proselytes before the victories of Clovis. But the Saxons and the Anglians were far more rude and savage in their manners; in their religion unreclaimed idolaters; they knew nothing of Christianity, but as the religion of that abject people whom they were driving before them into their mountains and fastnesses. Their conquest was not the settlement of armed conquerors amidst a subject people, but the gradual expulsion—it might almost seem, at length, the total extirpation—of the British and Roman British inhabitants. Christianity receded with the conquered Britons into the mountains of Wales, or towards the borders of Scotland, or took refuge among the peaceful and flourishing monasteries of Ireland. On the one hand, the ejection, more or less complete, of the native race, shows that the contest was fierce and long; the re-occupation of the island by paganism is a strong confirmation of the complete expul-

Christianity  
retires before  
the Saxons.

\* This will account for S. Alban's death in the persecution of Dioclesian, which did not extend, in its extreme violence at least, to the part of the empire governed by Constantius. Yet the doubtful protection of that emperor may neither have been able nor willing to prevent zealous officers from putting the military test to their soldiers. The

persecution began with the army.—See Hist. of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 270.

<sup>b</sup> S. Germain, Bishop of Auxerre, is said to have been sent into Britain to extirpate Pelagianism, which had spread to a great extent. But this, considering how early the monk left his native land, must be very doubtful.—The authority is Prosper.

sion of the Britons. The implacable hostility engendered by this continuous war, prevented that salutary re-action of the Christianity of the conquered races on the barbarian conquerors, which took place in other countries. The clergy fled, perhaps fought with their flocks, and neither sought nor found opportunities of amicable intercourse, which might have led to the propagation of their faith; while the savage pagans demolished the churches and monasteries (which must have existed in considerable numbers) with the other vestiges of Roman civilisation;<sup>c</sup> and were little disposed to worship the God of a conquered people—to adopt the religion of a race whom they either despised as weak and unwarlike, or hated as stubborn and implacable enemies.

A century—a century of continued warfare<sup>d</sup>—would hardly allay the jealousy with which the Anglo-Saxons would have received any attempt at conversion from the British churches; nor was there sufficient charity in the British Christians to enlighten the paganism of their conquerors. They consoled themselves (they are taunted with this sacrifice of Christian zeal to national hatred) for the loss of their territory, by the damnation of their conquerors, which they were not generous enough to attempt to avert; they would at least have heaven to themselves, undisturbed by the intrusion of the Saxon.<sup>e</sup> Happily Christianity appeared in an opposite quarter. Its missionaries from Rome were unaccompanied by any of these causes of mistrust or dislike. It came into that part of the kingdom the farthest removed from the hostile Britons. It was the religion of the powerful kingdom of the Franks; the influence of Bertha, the Frankish princess, the wife of King Ethelbert, wrought, no doubt more powerfully for the reception of the faith than the zeal and eloquence of Augustine.

<sup>c</sup> The fine legend of the halleluiah Victory, in which St. Germanus, at the head of an army of newly baptised Christians (at Easter), marched against the Saxons, chanting Alleluia, and overwhelming them with rocks and trees in a difficult pass of the Welsh mountains, is one of the brightest episodes in the war.

<sup>d</sup> The first Saxon invasion was A.C. 476. Augustine came to England, A.C. 597.

<sup>e</sup> “Qui inter alia inerrabilium scelearum facta, quæ historicus eorum Gildas flebili sermone describit, et hoc addebant, ut nunquam genti Saxonum sive Anglorum, secum Britanniam incolenti, verbum fidei prædicando committerent.”—Bede, H. E. i. c. 22.

Gregory the Great, it has been said, before his accession to the Papacy, had set out on the sublime though <sup>Gregory the Great.</sup> desperate mission of the re-conquest of Britain from idolatry. It was Gregory who commissioned the monk Augustine to venture on this glorious service. Yet so fierce and savage, according to the common rumour, were the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of Britain, that Augustine shrunk from the wild and desperate enterprise; he hesitated before he would throw himself into the midst of a race of barbarous unbelievers, of whose language he was ignorant. Gregory would allow no retreat from a mission which he had himself been prepared to undertake, and which would not have appalled, even under less favourable circumstances, his firmer courage.

The fears of Augustine as to this wild and unknown land proved exaggerated. The monk and his forty fol- <sup>Augustine.</sup> lowers landed without opposition on the shores of Britain. They sent to announce themselves as a solemn embassy from Rome, to offer to the King of Kent the everlasting bliss of heaven, an eternal kingdom in the presence of the true and living God. To Ethelbert, though not unacquainted with Christianity (by the terms of his marriage, Bertha, the Frankish princess, had stipulated for the free exercise of her religion), there must have been something strange and imposing in the landing of these peaceful missionaries on a shore still constantly swarming with fierce pirates, who came to plunder or to settle among their German kindred. The name of Rome must have sounded, though vague, yet awful to the ear of the barbarian; any dim knowledge of Christianity which he had acquired from his Frankish wife would be blended with mysterious veneration for the Pope, the great high priest, the vicar of Christ and of God upon earth. With the cunning suspicion which mingles with the dread of the barbarian, the king insisted that the first meeting should be in the open air, as giving less scope for magic arts, and not under the roof of a house. Augustine and his followers met the king with all the pomp which they could command, with a crucifix of silver in the van of their procession, a picture of the Redeemer borne aloft, and chaunting their litanies for the

salvation of the king and of his people. "Your words and offers," replied the king, "are fair; but they are new to me, and as yet unproved, I cannot abandon at once the faith of my Anglian ancestors." But the missionaries were entertained with courteous hospitality. Their severely monastic lives, their constant prayers, fastings, and vigils, with their confident demeanour, impressed more and more favourably the barbaric mind. Rumour attributed to them many miracles; before long the King of Kent was an avowed convert; his example was followed by many of his noblest subjects. No compulsion was used, but it was manifest that the royal favour inclined to those who received the royal faith.

Augustine, as the reward of his triumph, and as the encouragement of his future labours, was nominated to preside over the infant Church. He received a Metropolitan pallium, which made him independent of the bishops of Gaul. The choice of the see wavered for a short time between Canterbury and London, but it was eventually placed at Canterbury. The Pope already contemplated the complete spiritual conquest of the island, and anticipated a second metropolitan see at York. Each metropolitan was to preside in his province over twelve bishops.

The connexion  
with Rome.

So deliberately did the ardent Gregory partition this realm, which was still divided into conflicting pagan kingdoms. Augustine was in constant correspondence with Rome; he requested and received instructions upon some dubious points of discipline. The questions and the replies are deeply tinged with the monastic spirit of the times.<sup>8</sup> It might seem astonishing

<sup>7</sup> All this must have gone on through the cold process of interpretation, probably by some attendants of the queen. Augustine knew no Teutonic language. Latin to the Anglo-Saxons was as unknown.

<sup>8</sup> Some of the strange questions submitted to the Papal judgment have been the subject of sarcastic animadversion.\* But the age and system were in fault, not the men. There are functions of our animal nature on which the less the

mind dwells the better. It was the vital evil of the monastic system, that it compelled the whole thoughts to dwell upon them. The awfulness of the religious rites, which it was the object of this system to guard by the most minute provisions as to personal purity, was in all probability much more endangered. But on the whole it is impossible not to admire the gentleness, moderation, and good sense of Gregory's decisions. It is remarkable to find him shaking off the fetters of a rigid uniformity of ceremonial. "Ex singulis

\* Hume, Hist. ch. i.

that minds capable of achieving such great undertakings, should be fettered by such petty scruples; but unless he had been a monk, Augustine would hardly have attempted, or have succeeded in the conversion of Britain. With this monkish narrowness singularly contrasts the language of Gregory. On the more delicate question as to the course to be pursued in the conversion of the pagans, whether that of rigid, uncompromising condemnation of idolatry with all its feelings and usages, or the gentler though somewhat temporising plan of imbuing such of the heathen usages, as might be allowed to remain, with a Christian spirit, appropriating heathen temples to Christian worship, and substituting the saints of the Church for the deities of the heathen—was it settled policy, or more mature reflection which led the Pope to devolve the more odious duty, the total abolition of idolatry, with all its practices, upon the temporal power, the barbarian king; while it permitted the milder and more winning course to the clergy, the protection of the hallowed places and usages of the heathen from insult by consecrating them to holier uses? To Ethelbert the Pope writes, enjoining him, in the most solemn manner, to use every means of force as well as persuasion to convert his subjects; utterly to destroy their temples, to show no toleration to those who adhere to their idolatrous rites. This he urges by the manifest terrors of the Last Day, already darkening around; and by which, believing no doubt his own words, he labours to work on the timid faith of the barbarian. To Mellitus, now bishop of London, on the other hand, he enjoins great respect for the sacred places of the heathen, forbids their demolition; he only commands them to be cleared of their idols, to be purified by holy water for the services of Christianity; new altars are to be set up, and relics enshrined in the precincts. Even the sacrifices were to be continued under another name.<sup>b</sup>

Policy of  
Gregory.

ergo quibusque ecclesiis, quæ pia, quæ religiosa, quæ recta sunt, elige, et hæc quasi in fasciculum collecta, apud asylum mentis in consuetudinem depone.”  
—Bede, i. c. 27.

<sup>b</sup> “Quia si fana eadem bene constructa sunt, necesse est, ut a cultu

dæmonum in obsequio veri Dei debeant commutari; ut dum gens ipsa eadem fana sua non videt destrui, de corde errorem deponat, et Deum verum cognoscens ac adorans ad loca, quæ consuevit, familiaris concurrat.”—Greg. M. Epist. ad Mellit. : quoted also in Bede, i. 30.

The oxen which the heathen used to immolate to their gods were to be brought in procession on holy days; the huts or tents of boughs, which used to be built for the assembling worshippers, were still to be set up, the oxen slain and eaten in honour of the Christian festival: and thus these outward rejoicings were to train an ignorant people to the perception of true Christian joys.

The British Church, secluded in the fastnesses of Wales, could not but hear of the arrival of the Roman missionaries, and of their success in the conversion of the Saxons. Augustine and his followers could not but inquire with deep interest concerning their Christian brethren in the remote parts of the island. It was natural that they should enter into communication: unhappily they met to dispute on points of difference, not to join in harmonious fellowship on the broad grounds of their common Christianity. The British Church followed the Greek usage in the celebration of Easter; they had some other points of ceremonial, which, with their descent, they traced to the East: and the zealous missionaries of Gregory could not comprehend the uncharitable inactivity of the British Christians, which had withheld the blessings of the Gospel from their pagan conquerors. The Roman and the British clergy met, it is said, in solemn synod. The Romans demanded submission to their discipline, and the implicit adoption of the Western ceremonial on the contested points. The British bishops demurred; Augustine proposed to place the issue of the dispute on the decision of a miracle. The miracle was duly performed,—a blind man brought forward and restored to sight. But the miracle made not the slightest impression on the obdurate Britons. They demanded a second meeting, and resolved to put the Christianity of the strangers to a singular test, a moral proof with them more convincing than an apparent miracle. True Christianity, they said, “is meek and lowly of heart. Such will be this man (Augustine), if he be a man of God. If he be haughty and ungentle, he is not of God, and we may disregard his words. Let the Romans arrive first at the synod. If on our approach he rises from his seat to

British  
Church.

Meeting of  
Roman and  
British  
clergy.

receive us with meekness and humility, he is the servant of Christ, and we will obey him. If he despises us, and remains seated, let us despise him." Augustine sate, as they drew near, in unbending dignity. The Britons at once refused obedience to his commands, and disclaimed him as their Metropolitan. The indignant Augustine (to prove his more genuine Christianity) burst out into stern denunciations of their guilt, in not having preached the Gospel to their enemies. He prophesied (a prophecy which could hardly fail to hasten its own fulfilment) the divine vengeance by the arms of the Saxons. So complete was the alienation, so entirely did the Anglo-Saxon clergy espouse the fierce animosities of the Anglo-Saxons, and even embitter them by their theologic hatred, that the gentle Bede relates with triumph, as a manifest proof of the divine wrath against the refractory Britons, a great victory over that wicked race, preceded by a massacre of twelve hundred British clergy (chiefly monks of Bangor), who stood aloof on an eminence praying for the success of their countrymen.<sup>1</sup>

During the lifetime of Augustine, Christianity appeared to have gained a firm footing in the kingdom of Kent. A church arose in Canterbury, with dwellings for the bishop and his clergy; and a monastery without the walls, for the cœnobites who accompanied him. Augustine handed down his see in this promising state to his successor, Laurentius. The king of the East Angles (Essex) had followed the example of the King of Kent. Two other bishoprics, at London and at Rochester, had been founded, and entrusted to Mellitus and Justus. But Ethelbert, the Christian King of Kent, died, and was buried by the side of his wife, Bertha. About the same time died also Sebert, the King of Essex. The successors to both kingdoms fell back to paganism; both nations, at least the leading men, joined as readily in the rejection, as they had in the acceptance of Christianity. The new King of Kent was pagan in morals as in creed. He was inflamed with an unlawful passion for his father's

<sup>1</sup> "Itaque in hos primum arma verti jubet, et sic cæteras nefandæ militiæ copias . . . delevit."—H. E. ii. 2.

widow. The rudeness and simplicity of the men of Essex show how little real knowledge of the religion had been disseminated; they insisted on partaking of the fine white bread which the bishops were distributing to the faithful in the Eucharist: and when the clergy refused, unless they submitted to be baptized, they cast them out of the land.

It was a sad meeting of the three Christian bishops, who saw all their pious labours frustrated; and so Laurentius. desperate seemed the state of things, that the bishops of London and of Rochester fled into France. Laurentius determined on one last effort; it was prompted, as he declared, by a heavenly vision. He appeared one morning before the king, and, casting off his robe, showed his back scarred and bleeding from a recent and severe flagellation. The king inquired who had dared to treat with such indignity a man of his rank and character. The bishop averred that St. Peter had appeared to him by night, and had inflicted that pitiless but merited punishment for his cowardice in abandoning his heaven-appointed mission. The king was struck with amazement, bowed at once before the awful message, commanded the reinstatement of Christianity in all its honours, and gave the best proof of his sincerity in breaking off his incestuous connexion. The fugitive bishops were recalled; Justus resumed the see of Rochester, but the obstinate idolaters of London refused to receive Mellitus. That prelate, on the death of Laurentius, succeeded to the Metropolitan see of Canterbury.

The powerful kingdom of Northumberland was opened Christianity in Northumberland. to the first teachers of Christianity by the same influence which had prepared the success of Augustine in Kent. Edwin the king married a daughter of Ethelbert, the Christian sovereign of Kent. The same stipulation was made, as in the case of Bertha, for the free exercise of her religion. The sanctity attributed to their females by the whole German race, the vague notion that they were often gifted with prophetic powers, or favoured with divine revelations; with something, perhaps, of a higher cultivation and commanding gentleness, derived

from a purer religion, increased the natural ascendancy of birth and rank. Ethelberga was accompanied into Northumberland by the saintly Paulinus. Already, in the well-organised scheme of Gregory for the spiritual affairs of this island, York had been designated as the seat of a northern Metropolitan. Paulinus was consecrated before his departure bishop of that see. But Paulinus laboured long in vain; his influence reached no further than to prevent the family of the queen from relapsing into paganism.

Personal danger, the desire of revenge, and paternal feeling, opened at length the hard heart of Edwin. An assassin, in the pay of his enemy, the King of Wessex, attempted his life: the blow was intercepted by the body of a faithful servant. At that very time his queen was brought to bed of her first child, a daughter. Paulinus, who was present, in sincerity no doubt of heart, assured the king that he owed the safety of his life, and the blessing of his child, to the prayers which the bishop had been offering up to the God of the Christians. "If your God will likewise grant me victory over my enemies, and revenge upon the King of Wessex, I will renounce my idols, and worship him." As a pledge that he was in earnest, he allowed the baptism of the infant.

Edwin was victorious in his wars against Wessex. But, either doubting whether after all the God of the Christians was the best object of worship for a warlike race, or mistrusting his own authority over his subjects, he still hesitated, notwithstanding the urgent remonstrances of Paulinus, to fulfil his promise. He ceased to worship his idols, but did not accept Christianity. Even letters from the Pope to Edwin and his queen had but little effect. Paulinus now perhaps first obtained knowledge of Edwin's wild and romantic adventures in his youth, and of a remarkable dream, which had great influence on his future destiny. An exile from the throne of his fathers, Edwin had at length found precarious protection in the court of Redwald, king of the East Anglians. Warned that his host meditated his surrender to his enemies, he was abandoning himself to his desperate

Conversion of  
King Edwin.

fate, when an unknown person appeared to him in a vision, not only promised to fix the wavering fidelity of Redwald, but promised his restoration to the throne of his ancestors, in greater power and glory than had ever been obtained by any of the kings of the island.

Paulinus, however he obtained his knowledge, seized on this vision to promote his holy object. He Of the North-umbrians. boldly ascribed it to the Lord, who had already invested Edwin in his kingdom, given him victory over his enemies, and, if he received the faith, would likewise deliver him from the eternal torments of hell. Edwin summoned a conference of his pagan priesthood; this meeting gives a striking picture of the people and the times. To the solemn question, as to which religion was the true one, the High Priest thus replied: "No one has applied to the worship of our gods with greater zeal and fidelity than myself, but I do not see that I am the better for it; I am not more prosperous, nor do I enjoy a greater share of the royal favour. I am ready to give up those ungrateful gods; let us try whether these new ones will reward us better." But there were others of more reflective minds. A thane came forward and said, "To what, O King, shall I liken the life of man? When you are feasting with your thanes in the depth of winter, and the hall is warm with the blazing fire, and all around the wind is raging, and the snow falling, a little bird flies through the hall, enters at one door and escapes at the other. For a moment, while within, it is visible to the eyes, but it came out of the darkness of the storm, and glides again into the same darkness. So is human life; we behold it for an instant, but of what has gone before, or what is to follow after, we are utterly ignorant. If the new religion can teach this wonderful secret, let us give it our serious attention." Paulinus was called in to explain the doctrines of the Gospel. To complete the character of this dramatic scene, it is not the reflective thane, but the high priest who yields at once to the eloquence of the preacher. He proposed instantly to destroy the idols and the altars of his vain gods. With Edwin's leave, he put on arms and mounted a horse (the Anglian priests were

forbidden the use of arms and rode on mares), and, while the multitude stood aghast at his seeming frenzy, he spurred hastily to the neighbouring temple of Godmund-ingham, defied the gods by striking his lance into the wall, and encouraged and assisted his followers in throwing down and setting fire to the edifice. The temple and its gods were in an instant a heap of ashes.<sup>k</sup>

Edwin, with his family and his principal thanes, yielded their allegiance to Christianity. York was chosen as the seat of Paulinus the Metropolitan. In both divisions of the great Northumbrian kingdom, the archbishop continued for six years, till the death of Edwin, to propagate the Gospel with unexampled rapidity. For thirty-six consecutive days he was employed, in the royal palace of Glendale, in catechising and baptising in the neighbouring stream; and in Deira the number of converts was equal to those in Bernicia. The Deiran proselytes were baptised in the river Swale, near Catterick.

The blessings of peace followed in the train of Christianity. The savage and warlike people seemed tamed into a gentle and unoffending race. So great are said to have been the power and influence of Edwin as Bretwalda,<sup>m</sup> or Sovereign of all the kings of Britain, that a woman might pass, with her new-born babe, uninjured from sea to sea. All along the roads the king had caused tanks of water to be placed, with cups of brass, to refresh the traveller. Yet Edwin maintained the awfulness of military state; wherever he went he was preceded by banners; his rigorous execution of justice was enforced by the display of kingly strength.

But the times were neither ripe for such a government nor such a religion. A fierce pagan obtained, not at first the crown, but a complete ascendancy in yet un-Christianised Mercia. The savage Penda entered into a dangerous confederacy with Ceadwalla the Briton, King of Gwyneth, or North Wales. Ceadwalla

<sup>k</sup> Bede, ii. c. xiii.

<sup>m</sup> I leave the question as to the real existence of a Bretwalda to Mr. Kemble, and those, if there still are those, who resist his arguments. If no

Bretwalda, as is most probable, he had great power. Much of this history, so striking in many scenes, trembles on the verge of legend.

was a Christian, but the animosity of race was stronger than the community of religion. The ravages of the Briton were more cruel and ruthless than those of Penda

himself, who was thought ferocious even among  
A.D. 633. a ferocious and pagan people. Edwin fell in the great battle of Hatfield Chase, near Doncaster; and with Edwin seemed to fall the whole noble but unstable edifice of Christianity in the north of the island. The queen of Edwin fled with Paulinus to the court of her brother, the King of Kent.<sup>n</sup>

The successors to the Northumbrian kingdom, which was now again divided, Osric and Eanfrid, the sons of the former usurper, and enemies of Edwin, made haste to disclaim all connexion with the fallen king by their renunciation of Christianity. Both, however, were cut off, one in war, the other by treachery. Oswald was now the eldest surviving prince of the royal house of Edelfrid; and Oswald set up the Cross as his standard, appealed, and not in vain, to the Christian's God, and to the zeal of his Christian followers. After ages revered the Cross, to which was ascribed the victory of Oswald over the barbarous Ceadwalla, and the re-establishment of the kingdom; portions of the wood were said to be endowed with miraculous powers. The Roman clergy had fled with Paulinus after the fall of Edwin; and the gratified Oswald, eager to lose no time in the restoration of Christianity, looked to his nearest neighbours in Scotland for missionaries to accomplish the

holy work. The peaceful monastic establishments of Ireland had spread into Scotland, and made settlements in the Western Isles. Of these was Hii, or Iona, the retreat of the holy Columba; and in this wild island had grown up a monastery far renowned for its sanctity. From this quarter Oswald sought a bishop for the Northumbrian Church. The first who was sent was Corman, a man of austere and inflexible character, who, finding more resistance than he expected to his doctrines, in a full assembly of the nation, sternly re-

Fall of Edwin  
and of Chris-  
tianity.

Monasteries  
of Scotland  
and Ireland.

<sup>n</sup> Paulinus, who had received the pall of the archbishopric of York, as Pope Honorius, undertook the administration of the vacant bishopric of Rochester.—Bede, ii. 18.

proached the Northumbrians for their obstinacy, and declared that he would no longer waste his labours on so irreclaimable a race. A gentle voice was heard: "Brother, have you not been too harsh with your unlearned hearers? Should you not, like the apostles, have fed them with the milk of Christian doctrine, till they could receive the full feast of our sublimer truths?" All eyes were turned on Aidan, a humble but devout monk; by general acclamation, that discreet and gentle teacher was saluted as bishop. The Episcopal seat was placed at Lindisfarne, which received from a monastery, already established and endowed, the name of Holy Island. In this seclusion, protected by the sea from sudden attacks of pagan enemies, lay the quiet bishopric; and on the wild shores of the island the bishop was wont to sit and preach to the thanes and to the people, who crowded to hear him. Aidan was yet imperfectly acquainted with the Saxon language, and the king, who as an exile in Scotland had learned the Celtic tongue, sate at the bishop's feet, interpreting his words to the wondering hearers. From the Holy Island Aidan and his brethren, now familiar with the Saxon speech, preached the Gospel in every part of the kingdom;° they would receive no reward from the wealthy, only that hospitality required by austere and self-denying men; all gifts which they did receive were immediately distributed among the poor, or applied to the redemption of captives. Churches arose in all quarters, and Christianity seemed to have gained a permanent predominance throughout Northumbria.

Oswald might enjoy the pious satisfaction of assisting in the conversion of the most pagan of the Saxon kingdoms, that of Wessex.<sup>p</sup> The Bishop Birinus had been delegated by the Pope (Honorius) on this difficult enterprise. His success, if not altogether, was in great part due to the visit of Oswald, to demand in marriage the daughter of Cynegils, the king. The king, his whole family, and his principal thanes, received bap-

° Compare the high character of even excuses Aidan's error as to the Aidan in the Saxon, and as to ritual time of keeping Easter.—iii. 17. observance, Roman, Bede, iii. 5. Bede p "Paganissimos."—Bede.

tism at the hands of Birinus, for whose residence was assigned the city of Dorchester, near Oxford.

But paganism was still unbroken in Mercia, and at the head of the pagan power stood the aged but still ferocious and able Penda, who had already once overthrown the kingdom of Northumbria and killed in battle the Christian Edwin. A second invasion by Penda the Mercian was fatal to Oswald; he, too, fell in the field. His Death of Oswald. memory lived long in the grateful reverence of his people; his dying thoughts were said to have been of their eternal welfare; his dying words "The Lord have mercy on their souls." A miraculous power was attributed to the dust of the field where his blood had flowed; the places, where his head and arms had been exposed on high poles by the insulting conqueror till they were laid to rest by the piety of his successor, were equally fertile in wonders.

That successor, his brother Oswio, followed the example of Oswald's Christian devotion with better fortune. But the commencement of his reign was sullied by a most unchristian crime. While Oswio was placed on the throne of Bernicia, Oswin, of the race of Edwin, was raised to that of Deira. Oswin was beautiful in countenance and noble in person, affable, generous, devout. The attachment of the good Bishop Aidan to Oswin was scarcely stronger than that of his ruder subjects. Jealousies soon arose between the two kingdoms which divided Northumbria. The guileless Oswin was betrayed and murdered by the more politic Oswio. On the spot where the murder was committed, Gelling near Richmond, a monastery was founded, at once in respect for the memory of the murdered and as an atonement for the guilt of the murderer.

The ability of Penda and the unmitigated ferocity of the old Saxon spirit gave him an advantage over his more gentle and civilised neighbours. This aged chief now aspired to the nominal, as he had long possessed the actual, sovereignty over the island. He had dethroned the King of Wessex; East Anglia was subservient to his authority; his influence named the King of Deira, and when he laid

waste Bernicia as far as Bamborough, Oswio had neither the courage nor the power to resist the conqueror of Edwin and of Oswald. The influence of the gentler sex at length brought Mercia within the pale of Christianity. Alchfrid, the son of Oswio, had married the daughter of Penda. The son of Penda, Peada, visited his sister. Alchfrid, partly by his own influence, partly by the beauty of his sister Alchfleda, of whom Peada became enamoured, succeeded in winning Peada to the faith of Christ. Peada returned to the court of his father a baptised Christian, accompanied by four priests. With that indifference which belongs to all the pagan systems, especially in their decline, even Penda, though he adhered to his war-god Woden, did not oppose the free promulgation of Christianity; but with much shrewdness he enforced upon those who professed to believe the creed of the Gospel the rigorous practice of its virtues. They were bound to obey the God in whom they chose to believe.<sup>1</sup>

Penda himself maintained to the end his old Saxon and pagan privilege of ravaging his neighbours' territories and of enforcing the payment of an onerous tribute. His plunder and his exactions drove Oswio at length to despair. He promised a richer offering to God than he had ever paid to the Mercian Bretwalda, if he might obtain deliverance from the enemy of his family, his country, and his religion. The terrible battle which decided the fate of Northumbria, and led to the almost immediate reception of Christianity throughout the great kingdom of Mercia, was fought on the banks of the Aire<sup>r</sup> near Leeds. Penda fell, and with Penda fell paganism. According to the Saxon proverb, the death of five kings was avenged in the waters of Winwed—the death of Anna, of Sigebert, and of Egene, East Anglians, of Edwin and of Oswald.

Oswio, by this victory, became the most powerful king in the island. Immediately after the death of Penda he overran Mercia and East Anglia; his <sup>Power of Oswio.</sup> authority was more complete than had ever been exercised by any Bretwalda or supreme sovereign. The Christianity of the island was almost co-extensive with the sovereignty

<sup>1</sup> Bede, iii. 21.

<sup>r</sup> At Winwéd field.

of Oswio. In all the kingdoms, except by some singular chance, that of Sussex, it had been preached with more or less success. Everywhere episcopal sees had been founded and monasteries had arisen. In Kent, perhaps, alone the last vestiges of idolatry had been destroyed by the zeal of Ercombert. Essex, almost the first to entertain, was one of the last to settle down into a Christian kingdom. Redwald, who had first embraced the faith, had wanted power or courage to establish it throughout his kingdom. He attempted a strange compromise. A temple subsisted for some time, in which the king had raised an altar to Christ, East Anglia. A.D. 627. by the side of another which reeked with bloody sacrifices to the god of his fathers. But the zeal of his successors made up for the weakness of Redwald. Sigebert, the brother of Erpwald, Redwald's successor, abandoned the throne for the peaceful seclusion of a monastery. From this retreat he was forced in order to join in battle against the terrible Penda. He refused to bear arms, but not the less perished by the sword of the pitiless Mercian. But from that time Christianity prevailed in Essex, as well as throughout East Anglia, though A.D. 665. perhaps less deeply rooted than in other parts of the island: for in the fatal pestilence which not long after ravaged both England and Ireland, many of the East Anglians, ascribing it to the wrath of their deserted deities, returned to their former idolatry. The episcopal seat of Essex was in London; that of East Anglia, first at Dunwich, afterwards at Thetford.

But triumphant Christianity was threatened with an internal schism; one half of the island had been Division in the Anglo-Saxon Church. converted by the monks from Scotland, the other by those of Rome. They were opposed on certain points of discipline, held hardly of less importance than vital truths of the Gospel.\* The different period at which each, according to the Eastern or the Roman usage, celebrated Easter, became not merely a speculative question, in which separate kingdoms or separate Churches might pursue each its independent course, but a practical

\* It is curious to find Greek Christianity thus at the verge of the Roman world maintaining some of its usages and coequality.

evil, which brought dispute and discord even into the family of the king. The queen of Oswio, Eanfled, followed the Roman usage, which prevailed in Kent; Oswio, the king, cherished the memory of the holy Scottish prelate Aidan, and would not depart from his rule. So that while the queen was fasting with the utmost rigour on what in her calendar was Palm Sunday, the commencement of Passion week, the king was holding his Easter festival with conscientious rejoicings.

A synod was assembled at Whitby, the convent of the famous Abbess Hilda, at which appeared, on the Scottish side, Colman, the Bishop of Lindisfarne; on the other, Wilfrid, afterwards Archbishop of York, who had visited Rome, was firmly convinced of the Roman supremacy, and exercised great influence over Aelchfrid, the heir to the throne. With Wilfrid was Agilbert, afterwards Bishop of Paris, and other distinguished men. Colman urged the uninterrupted descent of their tradition from St. John; the authority of Anatolius, the ecclesiastical historian; and that of the saintly Columba, the founder of Iona. Wilfrid alleged the supreme authority of St. Peter and his successors, and the consent of the rest of the Catholic world. "Will he," concluded Wilfrid, "set the authority of Columba in opposition to that of St. Peter, to whom were given the keys of heaven?" The king broke in, and, addressing the Scottish prelates, said, "Do you acknowledge that St. Peter has the keys of heaven?" "Unquestionably!" replied Colman. "Then, for my part," said Oswio, "I will hold to St. Peter, lest, when I offer myself at the gates of heaven, he should shut them against me." To this there was no answer.

A second question, that of the tonsure, was agitated, if with less vehemence, not without strong altercation. The Roman usage was to shave the crown of the head, and to leave a circle of hair, which represented the Saviour's crown of thorns; the Scottish shaved the front of the head in the form of a crescent, and allowed the hair to grow behind. Here likewise the Roman party asserted the authority of St. Peter, and taunted their adversaries with following the example of Simon Magus and his followers!

Gradually the Roman custom prevailed on both these points: the Scottish clergy and monks in England by degrees conformed to the general usage; those who were less pliant retired to their remote monasteries in Iona or in Ireland.

In no country was Christianity so manifestly the parent of civilisation as among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors. The Saxons were the fiercest of the Teutonic race. Roman culture had, no more than the Gospel, approached the sandy plains or dense forests which they inhabited in the north of Germany. On the rude manners of the barbarian had been engrafted the sanguinary and brutalising habits of the pirate. Every vestige of the Roman civilisation of the island had vanished before their desolating inroad, and the Britons, during their long and stubborn resistance, had become as savage as their conquerors. The religion of the Anglo-Saxons was as cruel as their manners; they are said to have sacrificed a tenth of their principal captives on the altars of their gods.<sup>4</sup> A more settled residence in a country already brought into cultivation may in some degree have mitigated their ferocity, at all events weaned them from piratical adventure; but the century and a half which had elapsed before the descent of Augustine on their coasts had been passed in constant warfare, either against the Britons or of one kingdom against another.

Anglo-Saxon Britain had become again a world by itself, occupied by hostile races, which had no intercourse but that of war, and utterly severed from the rest of Europe. The effect of Christianity on Anglo-Saxon England was at once to re-establish a connexion both between the remoter parts of the island with each other, and of England with the rest of the Christian world. They ceased to dwell apart, a race of warlike, unapproachable barbarians, in constant warfare with the bordering tribes, or occupied in their own petty feuds or inroads; rarely, as in the case of Ethelbert, connected by intermarriage with some neighbouring Teutonic state. Though the Britons were still secluded in their mountains, or at the extremities of the land, by animosities which even Christianity could not allay, yet the Picts

<sup>4</sup> Sidon. Apoll. vii. 6. Compare Amm. p. 34; Zosimus, iii.; Orosius, vii. p. Marc. xxviii. p. 526; Procop. Hist. Goth. 549. See Lingard, Hist. of England, iv.; Julian, orat. i. in laud. Constant. ch. ii. p. 62-3.

and Scots, and the parts of Ireland which were occupied by Christian monasteries, were now brought into peaceful communication, first with the kingdom of Northumbria, and, through Northumbria, with the rest of England. The intercourse with Europe was of far higher importance, and tended much more rapidly to introduce the arts and habits of civilisation into the land. There was a constant flow of missionaries across the British Channel, who possessed all the knowledge which still remained in Europe. All the earlier metropolitans of Canterbury and the bishops of most of the southern sees were foreigners; they were commissioned at least by Rome, if not consecrated there; they travelled backwards and forwards in person, or were in constant communication with that great city, in which were found all the culture, the letters, the arts, and sciences which had survived the general wreck. But the nobler Anglo-Saxons began soon to be ambitious of the dignity, the influence, or the higher qualifications of the Christian priesthood. Nor were the Roman clergy or monks so numerous as to be jealous of those native labourers in their holy work; if there was any jealousy, it was of the independent Scottish missionaries, their rivals in the north, and the opponents of their discipline. A native clergy seems to have grown up more rapidly in Britain than in any other of the Teutonic kingdoms. But they were in general the admiring pupils of the Roman clergy. To them Rome was the centre and source of the faith: a pilgrimage to Rome, to an aspirant after the dignity or the usefulness of the Christian priesthood, became the great object and privilege of life. Every motive which could stir the devout heart or the expanding mind sent them forth on this holy journey: piety, which would actually tread a city honoured by the residence, and hallowed by the relics of apostles; awful curiosity, which would behold and kneel before the vicar of Christ on earth, the successor of that Pope who had brought them within the pale of salvation; perhaps the desire of knowledge, and the wish to qualify themselves for the duties of their sacred station. Nor was this confined to the clergy. Little more than half a century after the landing of

Intercourse  
with Rome.

Augustine, Alchfrid, the son of the King of Northumbria, had determined to visit the eternal city. He was only prevented by the exigencies of the times, and the authority of his father. He was no doubt excited to this design by the accounts of the secular and religious wonders of the city, which already filled the mind of the famous Wilfrid, to whom his father, Oswio, had entrusted his education. Wilfrid had already, once at least, visited Rome; his friend Benedict Biscop several times.

The life of Wilfrid, the first highly distinguished of the native clergy, is at once the history of Anglo-Saxon Christianity in Britain to its complete establishment, and a singular illustration of the effects of this intercourse with the centre of civilisation in Italy on himself and on his countrymen.<sup>a</sup>

Wilfrid was the son of a Northumbrian thane. The sanctity of his later life, as usual, reflected back a halo of wonder around his infancy. The house in which his mother gave him birth shone with fire, like the burning bush in the Old Testament. In his youth he was gentle, firm, averse to childish pursuits, devoted to study. A jealous stepmother seconded his desire to quit his father's house; she bestowed on him arms, a horse, and accoutrements, such as might beseem the son of a nobleman, when he should present himself at the court of his king. The beauty and quickness of the youth won the favour of the queen, Eanfled, who, discerning no doubt his serious turn of mind, entrusted him to the care of a cœnobite, with whom he retired to the monastery of Lindisfarne. After a few years he was seized with an earnest longing to visit the seat of the great apostle, St. Peter. Eanfled listened favourably to his design, gave him letters to her kinsman Ercombert, King of Kent; and, accompanied by another youth, Benedict Biscop, he crossed, in a ship provided and manned by King Ercombert, into France, and found his way to Lyons. In that city he was hospitably received by Delfinus, the rich and powerful prelate of the

<sup>a</sup> Eddii, Vit. S. Wilfridi apud Gale X. Scriptores compared with the Ecclesiastical History of Bede.

see. Delfinus was so captivated by his manners and character that he made him an offer of splendid secular employment, proposed to adopt him as his son, to marry him to his niece, and put him at the head of the government over great part of Gaul.\* But Wilfrid was too profoundly devoted to his religious views, too fully possessed with the desire of accomplishing his pilgrimage to Rome; he declined the dazzling offer of the noble virgin bride and her dowry of worldly power. He arrived at Rome; and if his mind, accustomed to nothing more imposing than the rude dwelling of a Northumbrian thane, or the church of wood and wattels, expanded at the sight of the cities, which probably, like Lyons, still maintained some of the old provincial magnificence, with what feelings must the stranger have trod the streets of Rome, with all its historical and religious marvels! In Rome the Archdeacon Boniface, one of the council of the Pope, kindly undertook the care of the young Saxon. <sup>In Rome.</sup> He instructed him in the four Gospels, in the Roman rule of keeping Easter, and other points of ecclesiastical discipline, unknown or unpractised in the Anglo-Saxon Church. He was at length presented to the successor of St. Peter, and received his blessing. Under the protection of certain relics, one of the inestimable advantages which often rewarded a pilgrimage to Rome, Wilfrid returned to his friend the Bishop of Lyons. There he resided three years; and now, tempted no more by secular offers, or acknowledged to be superior to them, he received, at his earnest request, the tonsure according to the Roman form. But Delfinus (so runs the legend) had incurred the animosity of the Queen Bathildis. With eight other bishops he was put to death. Wilfrid stood prepared to share the glorious martyrdom of his friend. His beauty arrested the arm of the executioner; and when it was found that he was a stranger he was permitted to depart in peace.†

\* Eddius, the biographer, and Bede agree in this statement. But there are great difficulties in the story. Smith, in his notes on Bede, observes that there is no Delfinus in the list of bishops of Lyons. (Could he be a prelate so called from being a native of Dauphiny?) And

in those troubled and lawless times in France, how could a bishop dispose of a civil government of such extent?

† Here is a greater difficulty. The Queen Bathildis is represented by the French historians, not as a Jezebel who slays the prophets of the Lord (as she is

The young Saxon noble, who had seen so many distant lands—had been admitted to the familiarity of such powerful prelates—had visited Rome, received the blessing of the Pope, and travelled under the safeguard of holy  
In Northumbria. relics—was received by his former friend Alchfrid, now the pious king of Northumbria, with wondering respect. He obtained first a grant of land at a place called Æstanford; afterwards a monastery was founded at Ripon, and endowed with xxx manses of land, of which Wilfrid was appointed abbot. He was then admitted into the priesthood by Agilbert, the Bishop of Wessex. Colman, the Scottish bishop of Lindisfarne, after his discomfiture in the dispute concerning Easter, retired in disgust and disappointment to his native Iona. Inda, another Scot, was carried off by the fatal plague, which at this time ravaged Britain. Upon his decease, the Saxon Wilfrid was named by common consent to the Northumbrian bishopric. But the plague had swept away the greater part of the southern prelates. Wina alone, the West-Saxon bishop, was considered by Wilfrid as canonically consecrated; the rest were Scots, who rejected the Roman discipline concerning Easter and the tonsure. Wilfrid went over to France; the firm champion of the Catholic discipline was received with the highest honours.

Consecrated at Compiègne.

No less than twelve bishops assembled for his consecration at Compiègne: he was borne aloft on a gilded chair, supported only by bishops—no one else was allowed to touch it. He remained some time (it is said three years) among his friends in Gaul.\* On his return to England a wild adventure on the shores of his native land showed how strangely the fiercest barbarism still encountered the progress of civilisation—paganism that of Christianity. The kingdom of Sussex was yet entirely heathen. Wilfrid was driven by a storm on its coast. The Saxon pirates had become merciless wreckers; they thought everything cast by the

called by Eddius), but as a princess of exemplary piety, a devout servant of the church, and the foundress of monasteries. Ebroin too, the Mayor of the Palace, in this legend is drawn in very dark

colours. But on Bathildis and Ebroin more hereafter.

\* There may be some confusion in his two periods of residence in Gaul.

winds and the sea on their coasts their undoubted property, the crew and passengers of vessels driven on shore their lawful slaves. They attacked the stranded bark with the utmost ferocity : the crew of Wilfrid made a gallant resistance. It was a strange scene. On one side the Christian prelate and his clergy were kneeling aloof in prayer ; on the other, a pagan priest was encouraging the attack, by what both parties supposed powerful enchantments. A fortunate stone from a sling struck the priest on the forehead, and put an end to his life and to his magic. But his fall only exasperated the barbarians. Thrice they renewed the attack, and thrice were beaten off. The prayers of Wilfrid became more urgent, more needed, more successful.\* The tide came in, the wind shifted ; the vessel got to sea, and reached Sandwich. At a later period of his life Wilfrid nobly revenged himself on this inhospitable people by labouring, and with success, in their conversion to Christianity.

On Wilfrid's return to Northumbria, after his long unexplained absence, he found his see preoccupied by Ceadda, a pious Scottish monk, a disciple of the venerated Aidan.<sup>b</sup> Wilfrid peaceably retired to his monastery at Ripon. He was soon summoned to more active duties : he obeyed the invitation of Wulfhere, King of Mercia, to extend Christianity in his kingdom. In the south he must have obtained high reputation ; on the death of Deus-dedit, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Wilfrid was entrusted with the care of the vacant diocese. On the arrival of Theodorus, who had been invested in the metropolitan dignity at Rome, almost his first act was to annul the election of Ceadda, and to place Wilfrid in the Northumbrian see at York. Ceadda made no resistance ; and as a reward for his piety and his submission, was appointed to the Mercian see of Lichfield.

The Christianity of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, whether from Rome or Iona, was alike monastic. That form of the religion already prevailed in Britain, when invaded by

\* Eddius compares the pagan priest to Balaam, the slayer to David, the resistance of this handful of men to that of Gideon, the prayers of Wilfrid to those of Moses and Aaron when

Joshua fought with Amalek.

<sup>b</sup> Perhaps after all Wilfrid was only nominated by the Roman party, who, diminished by the plague, may not have been able to support their choice.

the Saxons, with them retreated into Wales, or found refuge in Ireland. It landed with Augustine on the shores of Kent; and came back again, on the invitation of the Northumbrian king, from the Scottish isles. And no form of Christianity could be so well suited for its high purposes at that time, or tend so powerfully to promote civilisation as well as religion.

The calm example of the domestic virtues in a more polished, but often, as regards sexual intercourse, Monasticism of the church. more corrupt state of morals, is of inestimable value, as spreading around the parsonage an atmosphere of peace and happiness, and offering a living lesson on the blessings of conjugal fidelity; but such Christianity would have made no impression, even if it could have existed, on a people who still retained something of their Teutonic severity of manners, and required therefore something more imposing—a sterner and more manifest self-denial—to keep up their religious veneration. The detachment of the clergy from all earthly ties left them at once more unremittingly devoted to their unsettled life as missionaries, more ready to encounter the perils of this wild age; while (at the same time) the rude minds of the people were more struck by their unusual habits, by the strength of character shown in their labours, their mortifications, their fastings, and perpetual religious services. All these being, in a certain sense, monks, the bishop and his clergy cœnobites, or if they lived separate only less secluded and less stationary than other ascetics, wherever Christianity spread, monasteries, or religious foundations with a monastic character, arose. These foundations, as the religion aspired to soften the habits, might seem to pacify the face of the land. They were commonly placed, by some intuitive yearning after repose and security, in spots either themselves beautiful by nature, by the bank of the river, in the depth of the romantic wood, under the shelter of the protecting hill; or in such as became beautiful from the superior care and culture of the monks,—the draining of the meadows, the planting of trees, the home circle of garden or orchard, which employed or delighted the brotherhood. These establishments gradually acquired a certain sanctity: if

exposed like other lands to the ravages of war, no doubt at times the fear of some tutelary saint, or the influence of some holy man, arrested the march of the spoiler. If the growth of the English monasteries was of necessity gradual, the culture around them but of slow development (agricultural labour does not seem to have become a rule of monastic discipline), it was not from the want of plentiful endowments, or of ardent votaries. Grants of land and of moveables were poured with lavish munificence on these foundations; sometimes tracts of land, far larger than they could cultivate, and which were thus condemned to sterility. The Scottish monks are honourably distinguished as repressing, rather than encouraging, this prodigality.<sup>d</sup> The Roman clergy, if less scrupulous, might receive these tributes not merely as offerings of religious zeal to God, but under a conviction that they were employed for the improvement as well as the spiritual welfare of the people. Nor was it only the sacred mysterious office of ministering at the altar of the new God, it was the austere seclusion of the monks, which seized on the religious affections of the Anglo-Saxon convert. When Christianity first broke upon their rude but earnest minds, it was embraced with the utmost fervour, and under its severest forms. Men were eager to escape the awful punishments, and to secure the wonderful promises of the new religion by some strong effort, which would wrench them altogether from their former life. As the gentler spirit of the Gospel found its way into softer hearts, it made them loathe the fierce and rudely warlike occupations of their forefathers. To the one class the monastery offered its rigid course of ceremonial duty and its ruthless austerities, to the other its repose. Nobles left their halls, queens their palaces, kings their thrones, to win everlasting life by the abandonment of the pomp and the duties of their secular state, and, by becoming churchmen or monks, still to exercise rule, or to atone for years of blind and sinful heathenism.

<sup>c</sup> Bede calls some of these donations, "*stultissimos*."

<sup>d</sup> "*Aidanus, Finan et Colmannus, miræ sanctitatis fuerunt et parsimonie.*"

*Adeo enim sacerdotes erant illius temporis ab avaritiâ immunes ut nec territoria, nisi coacti, acceperunt.*"—Henric. Hunting. apud Gale, lib. iii. p. 333.

## CHAPTER IV.

## WILFRID — BEDE.

WILFRID, the type of his time, blended the rigour of the monk with something of prelate magnificence. The effect of his visit to more polished countries—to Gaul and Italy—soon appeared in his diocese. He who had seen the churches of Rome and other Italian cities, would not endure the rude timber buildings,<sup>a</sup> thatched with reeds—the only architecture of the Saxons—and above which the Scottish monks had not aspired.<sup>b</sup> The church of Paulinus at York had been built of stone, but it was in ruins; it was open to the wind and rain, and the birds flew about and built their nests in the roof and walls. Wilfrid repaired the building, roofed it with lead, and filled the windows with glass. The transparency of this unknown material excited great astonishment. At Ripon he built the church from the ground of smoothed stones; it was of great height, and supported by columns and aisles.<sup>c</sup> All the chieftains and thanes of the kingdom were invited to the consecration of this church. Wilfrid read from the altar the list of the lands which had been bestowed by former kings, for the salvation of their souls, upon the church, and those which were offered that day; and also of the places once dedicated to God by the Britons, and abandoned on their expulsion by the Saxons. This act was meant for the solemn recognition of all existing rights, the encouragement of future gifts, and, it seems, the assertion of vague and latent claims.<sup>d</sup> After this Christian or sacerdotal commemoration, there was something of a return to heathen usage, in three days and

<sup>a</sup> Lappenberg observes that the Anglo-Saxons have no other word for building but *getimbrian*, to work in wood.—*Geschichte Engl.*, i. 170.

<sup>b</sup> Eddius, c. xvi.

<sup>c</sup> “*Polito lapide a terrâ usque ad summum, ædificatam variis columnis et porticibus suffultam in cultum erexit et consummavit.*”—Eddius, xviii.

<sup>d</sup> Eddius, c. xvii.

three nights' uninterrupted feasting. But the architectural wonder of the age was the church at Hexham, which was said to surpass in splendour every building on this side of the Alps. The depth to which the foundations were sunk, the height and length of the walls, the richness of the columns and aisles, the ingenious multiplicity of the parts, as it struck the biographer of Wilfrid, give the notion of a building of the later Roman, or, as it is called, Byzantine style, aspiring into something like the Gothic.\*

The friend and companion of Wilfrid at Rome, Benedict Biscop (a monk of Holy Island), was introducing, in a more peaceful and less ostentatious way, the arts and elegancies of life. When about to build his monastery at Wearmouth, he crossed into Gaul to collect masons skilled in working stone after the Roman manner; when the walls were finished, he sent for glaziers, whose art till this time was unknown in Britain.<sup>f</sup> Nor was architecture the only art introduced by the pilgrims to

Benedict  
Biscop.

A.D. 676.

Rome. Benedict brought from abroad vessels for the altar, vestments which could not be made in England, and especially two palls, entirely of silk, of incomparable workmanship.<sup>g</sup> Books, embellished if not illuminated manuscripts, and paintings, came from the same quarter. Wilfrid's offering to the church of Ripon was a copy of the Gospels, written in letters of gold, on a purple ground.<sup>h</sup> Other manuscripts were adorned with gold and precious stones. On each of his visits to Rome Benedict brought less ornamented books; on one occasion a large number: and he solemnly charged his brethren, among his last instructions, to take every precaution for the security and preservation of their library. The pictures, which he brought from Rome, were to adorn two churches, one at Wearmouth,

\* "Cujus profunditatem in terrâ cum domibus mirificè politis lapidibus fundatam, et super terram multiplicem domum, columnis variis et multis porticibus suffultam, mirabilique altitudine et longitudine murorum ornatam, et variis linearum anfractibus viarum aliquando sursum, aliquando deorsum per cochleas circumductam."—Eddius, c. xxii.

<sup>f</sup> Painted glass seems to have been known at an early period in Gaul,—

"Sub versicoloribus figuris vernans herbidâ crusta,  
Sapphiratos flectit per prasinum vitrum  
capillæ." *Sidon. Apollin.*

This, however, seems a kind of mosaic.  
<sup>g</sup> "Vasa sancta, et vestimenta quia domi invenire non poterat . . . oloserica."

<sup>h</sup> "Auro purissimo in membranis depurpuratis, coloratis."—Eddius, c. xvii.

dedicated to St. Peter; one at Yarrow, to St. Paul. These were no doubt the earliest specimens of Christian painting in the country. In the ceiling of the nave at Wearmouth were the Virgin and the twelve apostles; on the south wall subjects from the Gospel history; on the north from the Revelations. Those in St. Paul's illustrated the agreement of the Old and New Testament. In one compartment was Isaac bearing the wood for sacrifice, and below the Saviour bearing his cross.<sup>1</sup>

So far Wilfrid rises to his lofty eminence an object of universal respect, veneration, and love. On a sudden he is involved in interminable disputes, persecuted with bitter animosity, degraded from his see, an exile from his country, and dies at length, though at mature age, yet worn out with trouble and anxiety. The causes of this reverse are lost in obscurity. It was not the old feud between the Roman and the Scottish clergy, for Theodorus, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the Roman party, joins the confederacy against him. As yet the jealousies between the secular and the regular clergy, the priests and monks, which at a later period, in the days of Odo and Dunstan, distracted the Anglo-Saxon Church, had not begun. The royal jealousy of the pomp and wealth of the bishop, which might seem to obscure that of the throne, though no doubt already in some strength, belongs in its intensity to other times. Egfrid, now King of Northumbria, had been alienated from Wilfrid, through his severe advice to the Queen Ethelreda, to persist in her vow of chastity. The first husband of Ethelreda had respected the virginity which she had dedicated to God. When compelled to marry Egfrid, she maintained her holy obstinacy, and took refuge, by Wilfrid's connivance, in a convent, to escape her conjugal duties. A new queen, Ercemburga, instead of this docile obedience to Wilfrid, became his bitterest enemy.<sup>2</sup> She it

<sup>1</sup> Bede, after describing the pictures, proceeds: "Quatenus intrantes ecclesiam omnes etiam literarum ignari, quaquaversum intenderent, vel semper amabilem Christi, sanctorumque ejus, quamvis in imagine contemplarentur aspectum: vel Dominicæ Incarnationis

gratiam vigilantiori mente recolent, vel extremi discrimen examinis quasi coram oculis habentes, districtius se ipsi examinare meminerint."—Smith's Bede, page 295.

<sup>2</sup> The language ascribed to Ercemburga might apply to a later archbishop

was who inflamed her husband with jealousy of the state, the riches, and the pride of the bishop, his wealthy foundations, his splendid buildings, his hosts of followers. Theodorus, the Archbishop of Canterbury, eagerly accepted the invitation of the King of Northumbria, to assist in the overthrow of Wilfrid.

Theodorus was a foreigner, a Greek of Tarsus, and might perhaps despise this aspiring Saxon. After the death of Archbishop Deusdedit, the see of Canterbury had remained vacant four years.

Theodorus  
Archbishop  
of Canter-  
bury.

The kings of Kent and Northumbria determined to send a Saxon, Wighard, to Rome, to receive consecration. Wighard died at Rome; the Pope Vitalian was urged to supply the loss. His choice fell upon Theodorus, a devout and learned monk. Vitalian's nomina-

A.D. 664.

A.D. 668.

tion awoke no jealousy, but rather profound gratitude.<sup>m</sup> It was not the appointment of a splendid and powerful primate to a great and wealthy church, but a successor to the missionary Augustine. But Theodorus, if he brought not ambition, brought the Roman love of order and of organization, to the yet wild and divided island; and the profound peace which prevailed might tempt him to reduce the more than octarchy of independent bishops into one harmonious community; as yet there were churches in England, not one church. Theodorus appears to have formed a great scheme for the submission of the whole island to his metropolitan jurisdiction. He summoned a council at Hertford, which enacted many laws for the regulation of the power of the bishops, the rights of monasteries, on keeping of Easter, on divorces, and unlawful marriages. Archbishop Theodorus began by dividing the great bishoprics in East Anglia and in Mercia, and deposed two refractory prelates. He proceeded on his sole spiritual authority,

of York, the object of royal envy and rapacity. "Enumerans ei . . . omnem gloriam ejus secularem, et divitias, nec non Cœnobiorum multitudinem, et ædificiorum magnitudinem, innumerumque sodalium exercitum, *regalibus* vestimentis et armis ornatum." This is not Wolsey, but Wilfrid.

<sup>m</sup> "Episcopum quem petierant a Romano Pontifice." There is a violent dispute (compare Lingard, *Anglo-Sax. Antiq.*, and note in Kemble's *Anglo-Saxons*, ii. 355) upon the nature of this appointment; all parties, except Mr. Kemble, appear to me to overlook the state of Christianity in England at the time.

with the temporal aid of the king, to divide the bishopric of York into three sees; and by the appointment of three bishops, Wilfrid was entirely superseded in his diocese."

Wilfrid appeals to Rome.

Wilfrid appealed to Rome, and set out to lay his case before the Pope.<sup>o</sup> So deep was the animosity, that his enemies in England are said to have persuaded Theodoric, King of the Franks, and Ebroin, mayor of the palace, to seize the prelate on his journey, and to put his companions to the sword. Winfred, the ejected Bishop of Mercia, was apprehended in his stead, and thrown into prison.

The wind was fortunately adverse to Wilfrid, and drove him on the coast of Friesland. The barbarous and pagan people received the holy man with hospitality; their fisheries that year being remarkably successful, this was attributed to his presence; and the king, the nobles, and the people, were alike more disposed to listen to the Gospel, first preached among them with Wilfrid's power and zeal. The way was thus prepared for his disciple, Willibrod, and for that remarkable succession of missionaries from England, who, kindred in speech, converted so large a part of Germany to Christianity.

After nearly a year passed in this pious occupation in Friesland, Wilfrid ventured into Gaul, and was favourably received by Dagobert II. Two years elapsed before he found his way to Rome. The Pope (Agatho) received his appeal, submitted it to a synod, who decided in his favour. Agatho issued his mandate for the reinstatement of Wilfrid in his see.

A.D. 679.  
October.

Though the Papal decree denounced excommunication against the layman, degradation and deprivation against the ecclesiastic, who should dare to disobey it, it was received by the King of Northumbria with contempt, and even by Archbishop Theodorus with indifference. Wilfrid, on his return, though armed with the papal authority, which he was accused of having obtained

<sup>o</sup> Eddius compares Egfrid and Theodorus to Balak and Balaam.—Wilkins, Concil.

<sup>o</sup> Eddius says that he left England amid the tears of many thousands of his monks.

by bribery,<sup>p</sup> was ignominiously cast into prison, and kept in solitary confinement. The queen, with the strange mixture of superstition and injustice belonging to the age, plundered him of his reliquary, a talisman which she kept constantly with her, in her own chamber and abroad. Wilfrid's faithful biographer relates many miracles, wrought during his imprisonment. The chains of iron, with which they endeavoured to bind him, shrunk or stretched, so as either not to admit his limbs, or to drop from them. The queen fell ill, and attributed her sickness to the stolen reliquary. She obtained his freedom, and was glad when the dangerous prelate, with his relics, was safe out of her kingdom.

He fled to Mercia, but the Queen of Mercia was the sister of Egfrid; to Wessex, but there the queen was the sister of Ercemburga; he found no safety. At length he took refuge among the more hospitable pagans of Sussex—the only one of the Saxon kingdoms not yet Christian. The king and the queen, indeed, had both been baptized; the king, Ethelwach, at the persuasion of Wulfhere, King of Mercia, who rewarded his Christianity with the prodigal grant of the Isle of Wight; Eabba, the queen, had been admitted to the sacred rite in Worcestershire. Yet, till the arrival of Wilfrid, they had not attempted to make proselytes among their subjects. They had rested content with their own advantages. A few poor Irish monks at Bosham (near Chichester) had alone penetrated the wild forests and jungles which cut off this barbarous tribe from the rest of England. But their rude hearts opened at once to the eloquence of Wilfrid. He taught them the arts of life as well as the doctrines of the Gospel. For three years this part of the island had suffered by drought, followed by famine so severe, that an epidemic desperation seized the people; they linked themselves by forties or fifties hand in hand, leaped from the rocks, were dashed

<sup>p</sup> See Eddius for this early instance of the suspected venality of the Roman curia. "Insuper (quod execrabilius erat), defamaverant in animarum suarum

perniciem, ut pretio dicerent redempta esse scripta, quæ ad salutem observantium ab apostolicâ sede destinata sunt." — c. xxxiii.

in pieces, or drowned.<sup>1</sup> Though a maritime people, on a long line of sea-coast, they were ignorant of the art of fishing. Wilfrid collected a number of nets, led them out to sea, and so provided them with a regular supply of food. The wise and pious benefactor of the nation was rewarded by a grant of the peninsula of Selsey (the isle of seals). There he built a monastery, and for five years exercised undisturbed his episcopal functions.

A revolution in the west and south of the island increased rather than diminished the influence of Wilfrid. Ceadwalla, a youth of the royal house of Wessex, had lived as an outlaw in the forests of Chiltern and Anderida. He appeared suddenly in arms, seized the kingdom of the West Saxons, conquered Sussex, and ravaged or subdued parts of Kent. Some obscure relation had subsisted between Ceadwalla (when an exile) and the Bishop Wilfrid.<sup>2</sup> Wilfrid's protector, Adelwalch, fell in battle during the invasion of the stranger. After Ceadwalla had completed his conquests by the subjugation of the Isle of Wight, Wilfrid became his chief counsellor, and was permitted by the king, still himself a doubtful Christian, if not a heathen, to convert the inhabitants; and Ceadwalla granted to the Church one-third of the Isle of Wight. The conversion of Ceadwalla is too remarkable to be passed over. It has been attributed to his horror of mind at the barbarous murder of his brother in Kent.<sup>3</sup> It was no light and politic conviction, but the deep and intense passion of a vehement spirit. The wild outlaw, the bloody conqueror, threw off his arms, gave up the throne which he had won by such dauntless enterprise and so much carnage. He went to

<sup>1</sup> The South Saxons are thus described:

"Gens igitur quadam scopulosis indita terris  
Saltibus incultis, et densis horrida dumis  
Non facilem propriis aditum præbebat in arvis,  
Gens ignara Dei, simulacris dedita vanis."  
*Fredegard*, p. 191.

Eddius admits that the South Saxons were compelled by the king to abandon their idolatry. According to Bede, they understood catching eels in the rivers.—*H. E.* iv. 13.

<sup>2</sup> "Sanctus antistes Christi in non-

nullis auxiliis et adjumentis sæpe anxiatum exulem adjuvavit et confirmavit."  
—Eddius, c. 41.

<sup>3</sup> According to Henry of Huntingdon, Ceadwalla was not a Christian when he invaded Kent. Wolf (his brother), a savage marauder, was surprised and burned in a house, in which he had taken refuge, by the Christians of the country. "Post hæc Ceadwalla Rex West Saxonie, de his et aliis sibi commissis poenitens, Romam perrexit."—*Apud X. Script.* p. 742.

Rome to seek that absolution for his sins, from which no one could so effectually relieve him as the successor of St. Peter. At Rome he was christened by the name of Peter. At Rome he died, and an epitaph, of no ordinary merit for the time, celebrated the first barbarian king, who had left his height of glory and of wealth, his family, his mighty kingdom, his triumphs and his spoils, his thanes, his castles, and his palaces, for the perilous journey and baptism at the hands of St. Peter's successor. His reward had been an heavenly for an earthly crown.<sup>1</sup>

Archbishop Theodorus was now grown old, and felt the approach of death; he was seized with remorse for his injustice to the exiled bishop of York. Wilfrid met his advances to reconciliation in a Christian spirit. In London Theodorus declared publicly that Wilfrid had been deposed without just cause, at his decease entrusted his own diocese to his charge, and recommended him as his own successor. Wilfrid either declined the advancement, or, more probably, was unacceptable to the clergy of the South. After a vacancy of two years, the Abbot of Reculver, whose name, Berchtwald, indicates his Saxon descent, was chosen. He was the first native who had filled the see.<sup>2</sup>

Wilfrid was again invested in his full rights as Bishop of York. The king, Egfrid, had fallen in battle against the Picts. His successor was Aldfrid, who had been educated in piety and learning by certain Irish monks. This, though an excellent school for some Christian virtues, had not taught him humble submission to the lofty Roman pretensions of Wilfrid. The feud between the king and the bishop broke out anew. Wilfrid pressed some antiquated claims on certain alienated possessions of the Church; the king proposed to erect Ripon

Wilfrid re-  
instated in  
York.

<sup>1</sup> "Culmen, opes, sobolem, pollentia regna, triumphos,  
Exuvias, proceres, moenia, castra, Lares,  
Quæque patrum virtus et quæ congesserat ipse  
Cædwal arripotens liquit amore Dei.  
Ut Petrum sedemque Petri rex cerneret hospes,  
Cujus fonte meras sumeret almus aquas,  
Splendidumque jubar radianti sumeret haustu,  
Ex quo vivificus fulgor ubique fluit.  
Percipiensque alacer redivivæ præmia vitæ  
Barbaricam rabiem, nomen et inde suum  
Conversus, convertit ovas, Petrumque vocari,  
Sergius Antistes jussit, ut ipse Pater  
Fonte renascentis, quem Christi gratia purgans  
Protinus ablutum vexit in arce poli.

Mira fides regis! clementia maxima Christi,  
Cujus consilium nullius adire potest!  
Sospes enim veniens supremo ex orbe Britanni,  
Per varias gentes, per freta, perque vias,  
Urbem Romuleam vidit, templumque verendum  
Aspexit Petri, mystica dona gerens.  
Candidus inter oves Christi sociabilis ivit,  
Corpore nam tumulum, mente superna tenet;  
Commūtasse magis scriptorum insignia credas,  
Quem regnum Christi præmeruisse vides."

Bede, H. E. v. 7.

<sup>2</sup> According to the Saxon chronicle and others. Bede calls him a native of Wessex.

into a bishopric independent of York. Wilfrid retired to the court of Mercia.

A general synod of the clergy of the island was held at a place called Eastanfeld. The synod demanded the unqualified submission of Wilfrid to certain constitutions of Archbishop Theodorus. Wilfrid reproached them with their contumacious resistance, during twenty-two years, to the decrees of Rome, and tauntingly inquired whether they would dare to compare their archbishop of Canterbury (then a manifest schismatic) with the successors of St. Peter.<sup>v</sup> However the clergy might reverence the spiritual dignity of Rome, the name of Rome was probably less imposing to the descendants of the Saxons than to most of the Teutonic tribes. The Saxons had only known the Romans in their decay, as a people whom they had driven from the island. The name was perhaps associated with feelings of contempt rather than of reverence. The king and the archbishop demanded Wilfrid's signature to an act of unconditional submission. Warned by a friendly priest that the design of his enemies was to make him surrender all his rights, and pronounce his own degradation, Wilfrid replied with a reservation of his obedience to the canons of the fathers. They then required him to

*Expansion of  
Wilfrid.*

retire to his monastery at Ripon, and not to leave it without the king's permission; to give up all the papal edicts in his favour; to abstain from every ecclesiastical office, and to acknowledge the justice of his own deposition. The old man broke out with a clear and intrepid voice into a protest against the iniquity of depriving him of an office, held for forty years. He recounted his services to the Church; the topics were singularly ill-chosen for the ear of the king. He had extirpated the poisonous plants of Scottish growth, had introduced the true time of keeping Easter, and the orthodox tonsure; he had brought in the antiphonal harmony, and having done all this (of his noble apostolic labours, his conversion of the heathen, his cultivation of arts and letters, his stately

<sup>v</sup> "Interrogaviteos quâ fronte auderent statutis apostolicis ab Agathone sancto et Benedicto electo, et beato Sergio sanctissimis papis ad Britanniam pro salute

animarum directis præponere, aut eligere decreta Theodori episcopi quæ in discordiâ constituit." So writes Eddius, no doubt present at the synod.

buildings, his monasteries, he said nothing), "am I to pronounce my own condemnation? I appeal in full confidence to the apostolic tribunal." He was allowed to retire again to the court of Mercia. But his enemies proceeded to condemn him as contumacious; the sentence was followed by his excommunication, with circumstances of more than usual indignity and detestation. Food which had been blessed by any of Wilfrid's party was to be thrown away as an idol offering; the sacred vessels which he had used were to be cleansed from the pollution.

But the dauntless spirit of Wilfrid was unbroken, his confidence in the rightful power of the pope unshaken. At seventy years of age he again undertook the dangerous journey to Italy, again presented himself before the pope, John V. A second decree was pronounced in his favour. On his return, the archbishop, overawed, or less under the influence of the Northumbrian king, received him with respect. But the king, Aldfrid, refused all concession. "I will not alter one word of a sentence issued by myself, the archbishop, and all the dignitaries of the land, for a writing coming, as ye say, from the apostolic chair." The death of Aldfrid followed; it was attributed to the divine vengeance; and it was also given out that, on his death-bed, he had expressed deep contrition for the wrongs of Wilfrid. On the accession of Osred a new synod was held on the banks of the Nid. The archbishop <sup>A.D. 706.</sup> Berchtwald appeared with Wilfrid, and produced the apostolic decree, confirmed by the papal excommunication of all who should disobey it. The prelates and thanes seemed disposed to resist; they declared their reluctance to annul the solemn decision of the synod at Eastanfeld. The abbess Alfreda, the sister of the late king, rose, and declared the death-bed penitence of Aldfrid for his injustice. She was followed by the ealdorman, Berchfrid, the protector of the realm during the king's minority, who declared that, when hard pressed in battle by his enemies, he had vowed, if God should vouchsafe his deliverance, to espouse Wilfrid's cause. That deliverance was a manifest declaration of God in favour of Wilfrid. Amity was restored, the bishops interchanged the kiss of peace;

Wilfrid re-assumed the monasteries of Ripon and Hexham. The few last years of his life (he lived to the age of 76) soon glided away. He died in another monastery, which he had founded at Oundle; his remains were conveyed with great pomp to Ripon.

Death of Wilfrid. A.D. 709.

So closes the life of Wilfrid, and the first period of Christian history in England. The sad scenes of sacerdotal jealousy and strife, which made his course almost a constant feud and himself an object of unpopularity, even of persecution, are lost in the spectacle of the blessings conferred by Christianity on our Saxon ancestors. Even the wild cast of religious adventure in his life was more widely beneficial than had been a more tranquil course. As the great Prelate of the North, as a missionary, his success showed his unrivalled qualifications. As a bishop, he provoked hostility by an ecclesiastical pomp, which contrasted too strongly with the general poverty, and his determination to enforce strict conformity to the authority of Rome offended the converts of the Scottish monks. His banishment into wild pagan countries, and his frequent journeys to Rome, were advantageous, though in a very different manner, the one to the rude tribes to whom he preached the Gospel, the latter to his native land. He never returned to England without bringing something more valuable than Papal edicts in his own favour.\*

The hatred of the churchmen of this time might seem reserved for each other; to all besides their influence was that of pure Christian humanity. Their quarrels died with them; the civilisation which they introduced, the milder manners, the letters, the arts, the sciences survived. On the estates which the prodigal generosity of the kings, especially when they gained them from their heathen neighbours, bestowed on the Church, the immediate manumission of the slaves, could not but tend to mitigate the general condition of that class. Some of these were probably of British descent, and so Christianity might allay even that inveterate national hostility. Nor were their own predial slaves alone directly benefited by their in-

\* Compare Kemble's *Anglo-Saxons*, had anticipated the high authority of ii. 432 *et seq.* I was glad to find that I Mr. Kemble.

fluence of the Churchmen. The redemption of slaves was one of the objects for which the canons allowed the alienation of their lands. Among the pious acts by which a wealthy penitent might buy off the corporal austerities demanded by the discipline of the Church, was the enfranchisement of his slaves. The wealth which flowed into the Church at that time in so full a stream was poured forth again in various channels for the public improvement and welfare.<sup>7</sup> The adversaries of Wilfrid, as well as his friends, like Benedict Biscop, were his rivals in this generous strife for the advancement of knowledge and civility. Theodorus, the archbishop, was a Greek by birth; perhaps his Greek descent made him less servilely obedient to Rome. While the other ecclesiastics were introducing the Roman literature with the Roman service, Theodorus founded a school in Canterbury for the study of Greek. He bestowed on this foundation a number of books in his native language, among them a fine copy of Homer.

The rapid progress of Christianity and her attendant civilisation, appears from the life and occupations of Bede. Not much more than seventy years Bede born 673, died 735. after the landing of Augustine on the savage, turbulent, and heathen island, in a remote part of one of the northern kingdoms of the Octarchy, visited many years later by its first Christian teacher, a native Saxon is devoting a long and peaceful life to the cultivation of letters, makes himself master of the whole range of existing knowledge in science and history, as well as in theology; and writes Latin both in prose and verse, in a style equal to that of most of his contemporaries. Nor did Bede stand alone; the study of letters was promoted with equal activity by Archbishop Theodorus, and by Adrian, who having declined the archbishopric, accompanied Theodorus into the island. Aldhelm<sup>\*</sup> of Malmesbury was only inferior in the extent of his acquirements, as a writer of Latin poetry, far superior to Bede.

The uneventful life of Bede was passed in the monastery

<sup>7</sup> Burke observes, "They extracted the fruits of virtue even from crimes, and whenever a great man expiated his private offences, he provided in the same

act for the public happiness."—Abridgment of Eng. Hist. Works, x. p. 268.

<sup>\*</sup> Aldhelm was born about 656, died 709.

under the instructor of his earliest youth, Benedict Biscop. Its obscurity, as well as the extent of his labours, bears witness to its repose.\* Bede stood aloof from all active ecclesiastical duties, and mingled in none of the ecclesiastical disputes. It was his office to master, and to disseminate through his writings, the intellectual treasures brought from the continent by Benedict.

Even if Bede had been gifted with original genius, he was too busy in the acquisition of learning to allow it free scope. He had the whole world of letters to unfold to his countrymen. He was the interpreter of the thoughts of ages to a race utterly unacquainted even with the names of the great men of pagan or of Christian antiquity.

The Christianity of the first converts in the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was entirely ritual. The whole theology of some of the native teachers was contained in the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. Some of them were entirely ignorant of Latin, and for them Bede himself translated these all-sufficient manuals of Christian faith into Anglo-Saxon.<sup>b</sup> Bede was the parent of theology in England. Whatever their knowledge, the earlier foreign bishops were missionaries, not writers; and the native prelates were in general fully occupied with the practical duties of their station. The theology of Bede flowed directly from the fountain of Christian doctrine, the sacred writings. It consists in commentaries on the whole Bible. But his interpretation is that which now prevailed universally in the Church. By this the whole volume is represented as a great allegory. Bede probably did little more than select from the more popular Fathers, what appeared to him the most subtle and ingenious, and therefore most true and

\* The Pope Sergius is said to have invited Bede to Rome in order to avail himself of the erudition of so great a scholar. This invitation is doubted.—See Stevenson's Bede, on another reading in the letter adduced by William of Malmesbury. I agree with Mr. Wright (Biograph, Lit. p. 265), that it is more probable the Pope should send for Bede than for a nameless monk from the monastery at Wearmouth. It is nearly certain that Bede did not go to Rome.

The death of Pope Sergius accounts very naturally for Bede's disobedience to the papal mandate, or courteous invitation.

<sup>b</sup> See the letter of Bede to Bishop Egbert, in which he enjoins him to enforce the learning these two forms by heart: "Quod non solum de laicis, id est, in populari vitâ constitutis, verum etiam de clericis sive monachis, qui Latine sunt linguæ expertes, fieri oportet." He urges their efficacy against the assaults of unclean spirits.—Smith's Bede, p. 306.

edifying exposition. Even the New Testament, the Gospels, and Acts, have their hidden and mysterious, as well as their historical signification. No word but enshrines a religious and typical sense.<sup>c</sup>

The science as the theology of Bede was that of his age—the science of the ancients (Pliny was the author chiefly followed), narrowed rather than expanded by the natural philosophy, supposed to be authorised and established by the language of the Bible.<sup>d</sup> Bede had read some of the great writers, especially the poets of antiquity. He had some familiarity with Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, and even Lucretius. This is shown in his treatises on Grammar and Metre. His own poetry is the feeble echo of humbler masters, the Christian poets, Prudentius, Sedulius, Arator, Juvenius, which were chiefly read in the schools of that time. It may be questioned, however, whether many of the citations from ancient authors often adduced from mediæval writers, as indicating their know-

\* "De rerum natura," in Giles, vol. vi.

<sup>d</sup> It is this Christian part of Bede's natural philosophy, which alone has much interest, as showing the interworking of the biblical records of the creation, now the popular belief, into the old traditionary astronomy derived by the Romans from the Greeks; and so becoming the science of Latin Christendom. The creation by God, the creation in six days, is of course the groundwork of Bede's astronomical science. The earth is the centre and primary object of creation. The heaven is of a fiery and subtle nature, round, equidistant in every part, as a canopy, from the centre of the earth. It turns round every day, with ineffable rapidity, only moderated by the resistance of the seven planets,—three above the sun: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, then the Sun; three below: Venus, Mercury, the Moon. The stars go round in their fixed courses; the northern perform the shortest circle. The highest heaven has its proper limit; it contains the angelic virtues, who descend upon earth, assume ethereal bodies, perform human functions, and return. The heaven is tempered with glacial waters, lest it should be set on fire; the inferior heaven is called the firmament, because it separates these superincum-

bent waters from the waters below. These firmamental waters are lower than the spiritual heavens, higher than all corporeal beings, reserved, some say, for a second deluge, others more truly, to temper the fire of the stars. The rest of Bede's system on the motions of the planets and stars, on winds, thunder, light, the rainbow, the tides, belongs to the history of philosophy; his work on the Nature of Things is curious as showing a monk, on the wild shores of Northumberland, so soon after the Christianisation of the island, busying himself with such profound questions, if not observing, recording the observations of others on the causes of natural phenomena; learning all that he could learn, teaching all he had learned, in the Latin of his time, promoting at least, and pointing the way to these important studies. Bede's chronological labours (he was a strenuous advocate for the shorter Hebrew chronology of the Old Testament, in order to establish his favourite theory, so long dominant in theology, of the six ages of the world) implied and displayed powers of calculation rare at that time in Latin Christianity, in England probably unrivalled, if not standing absolutely alone.—Epist. ad Pleguin., Giles, i. p. 145.

ledge of such authors, are more than traditionary, almost proverbial, insulated passages, brilliant fragments, broken off from antiquity, and reset again and again by writers borrowing them from each other, but who had never read another word of the lost poet, orator, or philosopher.

The works of Bede were written for a very small intellectual aristocracy; to all but a few among the monks and clergy, Latin was a foreign language, in which they recited, with no clear apprehension of its meaning, the ordinary ritual.\*

But even at this earlier period, Christianity seized and pressed into her service the more effective vehicle of popular instruction, the vernacular poetry. No doubt from the first there must have been some rude preaching in the vulgar tongue, but the extant Anglo-Saxon homilies are of a later date. Cædmon, however, the greatest of the Anglo-Saxon poets, flourished during the youth of Bede. So marvellous did the songs of Cædmon, pouring forth as they did the treasures of biblical poetry, the sublime mysteries of the Creation, the Fall, the wonders of the Hebrew history, the gentler miracles of the New Testament, the terrors of the judgment, the torments of hell, the bliss of heaven, sound to the popular ear, that they could be attributed to nothing less than divine inspiration. The youth and early aspirations of Cædmon were invested at once in a mythic character like the old poets of India and of Greece, but in the form of Christian miracle.

The Saxons, no doubt, brought their poetry from their native forests. Their bards were a recognised order: in all likelihood in the halls of the kings of the Octarchy, the bard had his seat of honour, and while he quaffed the mead, sang the victories of the thanes and kings over the degenerate Roman and fugitive Briton. Of these lays some fragments remain, earlier probably than the introduction of Christianity; but tinged with Christian allusion

\* See above, quotation from Epist. to Egbert. Bede adds, that for this purpose he had himself translated the Creed and Lord's Prayer into the vernacular Anglo-Saxon. "Propter quod et ipse multis sæpe sacerdotibus idiotis,

hæc quoque utraque, et symbolum videlicet, et Dominicam orationem, in linguam Anglorum translata obtuli." — Epist. ad Egbert. His birth is uncertain; he died about 680.

in their later tradition from bard to bard: such are the Battle of Conisborough, the Traveller's Song, and the Romance of Beowulf.<sup>f</sup> The profoundly religious mind of Cædmon could not endure to learn these profane songs of adventure and battle, or the lighter and more mirthful strains. When his turn came to sing in the hall, and the harp was handed to him, he was wont to withdraw in silence and in shame.<sup>g</sup> One evening he had retired from the hall; it was that night his duty to tend the cattle; he fell asleep. A form appeared to him in a vision and said, "Sing, O Cædmon!" Cædmon replied, "that he knew not how to sing, he knew no subject for a song." "Sing," said the visitant, "the Creation." The thoughts and the words flashed upon the mind of Cædmon, and the next morning his memory retained the verses, which Bede thought so sublime in the native language as to be but feebly rendered in the Latin.

The wonder reached the ears of the famous Hilda, the abbess of Whitby: it was at once ascribed to the grace of God. Cædmon was treated as one inspired. He could not read, he did not understand Latin. But when any passage of the Bible was interpreted to him, or any of the sublime truths of religion unfolded, he sate for some time in quiet rumination, and poured it all forth in that brief alliterative verse, which kindled and enchanted his hearers. Thus was the whole history of the Bible, and the whole creed of Christianity, in the imaginative form which it then wore, made at once accessible to the Anglo-Saxon people. Cædmon's poetry was their bible, no doubt far more effective in awakening and changing the popular mind than a literal translation of the Scriptures could have been. He chose, by the natural test of his own kindred sympathies, all which would most powerfully work on the imagination, or strike to the heart of a rude yet poetic race.

The Anglo-Saxon was the earliest vernacular Christian poetry, a dim prophecy of what that poetry might become

<sup>f</sup> Kemble's *Beowulf*, with preface.

<sup>g</sup> "Unde nonnunquam in conviviis, cum esset lætitiæ causâ, et omnes per ordinem cantare deberent, ille ubi ap-

propinquare sibi citharam cernebat, surgebat a mediâ cœnâ, et egressus ad suam domum repedabat."—Bede, H. E. iv. c. 24.

in Dante and Milton. While all the Greek and Latin poetry laboured with the difficulties of an uncongenial diction and form of verse; and at last was but a cold dull paraphrase of that which was already, in the Greek and in the Vulgate Bible, far nobler poetry, though without the technical form of verse; the Anglo-Saxon had some of the freedom and freshness of original poetry. Its brief, sententious, and alliterative cast seemed not unsuited to the parallelism of the Hebrew verse; and perhaps the ignorance of Cædmon kept him above the servility of a mere translation.<sup>b</sup>

Aldhelm of Malmesbury was likewise skilled in the vernacular poetry, but though he used it for the purpose of religious instruction, it does not seem to have been written verse, though one of his songs survived in the popular voice for some time.<sup>1</sup> What he no doubt considered the superior majesty or sanctity of the Latin was alone suited for such mysterious subjects. Of Aldhelm it is recorded that he saw with sorrow the little effect which the services of religion had on the peasantry, who either listened with indifference to the admonitions of the preacher, or returned home utterly forgetful of his words. He stationed himself therefore on a bridge over which they must pass, in the garb of a minstrel, and when he had arrested the crowd, and fully enthralled their attention by the sweetness of his song, he gradually introduced into his profane and popular lay some of the solemn truths of religion. Thus he succeeded in awakening a deeper

<sup>b</sup> The poetry of Cædmon may be judged by the admirable translations in the volume on Anglo-Saxon poetry by J. J. Coneybeare; the whole has been edited, with his fulness of Anglo-Saxon learning, by Mr. Thorpe; London, 1832. Mr. Coneybeare may to a certain degree have Miltonised the simple Anglo-Saxon; but he has not done more than justice to his vigour and rude boldness.

<sup>1</sup> "Nativæ quippe linguæ non negligebat carmina, adeo ut teste libro Elfredi, de quo superius dixi, nullâ unquam ætate par ei fuerat uspiam poesin Anglicam posse facere, tantum componere, eadem appositè vel canere vel dicere. Denique commemorat Elfredus carmen triviale Adhelmmum fecisse; adjiciens causam

qua probet rationaliter tantum virum his quæ videntur frivola instituisse. Populum eo tempore semibarbarum, parum divinis sermonibus intentum, statim cantatis missis domos cursitare solitum: ideoque sanctum virum, super pontem qui rura et urbem continuat, abeuntibus se opposuisse obicem, quasi artem cantandi professum. Eo plus quam semel facto, plebis favorem et concursus emeritum hoc commento, sensim inter ludicra verbis scripturarum insertis, cives ad sanitatem reduxisse, qui si severè et cum excommunicatione agendum putasset profecto profecisset nihil."—W. Malmesb. Vit. Adhelm.; Wharton, Anglia Sacra, p. 4.

devotion and won many hearts to the faith, which he would have attempted in vain to move by severer language, or even by the awful excommunication of the church. What he himself no doubt despised, his vernacular verse, in comparison with the lame stateliness of his poor hexameters, ought to have been his pride.

Among a people accustomed to the association of music, however rude, with their poetry, the choral service of the church must have been peculiarly impressive. The solemn Gregorian system of chanting was now established in Rome, and was introduced into England by the Roman clergy and by those who visited Rome, with zealous activity. Here, though opposed on some points, Archbishop Theodorus and Wilfrid acted in perfect amity.<sup>k</sup> In Kent the music of the church had almost from the first formed a part of the divine worship, and James the Deacon, the companion of Paulinus, had taught it in Northumbria. It is recorded to the praise of Theodorus that on his visitation throughout the island he introduced everywhere that system of chanting which had hitherto been practised in Kent alone; and among the important services to the church, of which Wilfrid boasted before the synod of Eastrefield, is the introduction of antiphonal chanting.<sup>l</sup> So much importance was attached to this part of the service, that Pope Agatho permitted John, the chief of the Roman choir, to accompany Benedict Biscop to England<sup>m</sup> in order to instruct the monks of Wearmouth in singing: John gave lessons throughout Northumbria.

Even at this early period the Anglo-Saxon laws are strongly impregnated with the dominant Christianity: they are the laws of kings, whose counsellors, if not their co-legislators, are prelates. In those of King Ina of Wessex, either the parent or the priest is bound to bring, or force to be brought, the infant to holy baptism within thirty days under a penalty of thirty shillings;<sup>n</sup> if he

<sup>k</sup> Bede, H. E. iv. 2.

<sup>l</sup> "Aut quomodo juxta ritum primitivæ ecclesiæ consono vocis modulamine binis astantibus choris persultare, responsoriis antiphonisque reciprocis instruerem."—Eddius, c. 45.

<sup>m</sup> Bede, H. E. iv. 18. On this and on the pictures brought from Rome on more than one occasion, compare Wright, *Biographia Literaria*, Life of B. Biscop.

<sup>n</sup> Thorpe, vol. i. p. 103; Kemble, ii. 490 *et seqq.* et append. D.

should die unbaptized, the wehrgeld of this spiritual death is the whole possessions of the guilty person. Spiritual relationship was placed in the same rank with natural affinity. The godfather claimed the wehrgeld for the death of his godson, the godson for that of the godfather. Sunday was hallowed by law. The slave who worked by his lord's command was free, and the lord paid a fine; if by his own will, without his lord's knowledge, he suffered corporal chastisement. If the free man worked on the holy day without his lord's command, he lost his freedom or paid a compensation of sixty shillings.

Already the awful church had acquired a recognised right of sanctuary. The nature of kirk shot, a payment of certain corn and seed as first fruits, is somewhat obscure, whether paid to the church as the church, or to the church only from lands held of the church. The laws of Kent during the archiepiscopate of Berchthwald, protect the Sabbath, punish certain immoralities, and guarantee all grants of lands to the church: there are even exemptions from secular imposts.

Thus, then, in less than a century and a half from the  
A.D. 597-735. lauding of Augustine to the death of Bede, above  
half a century before the conflicting kingdoms  
were consolidated into one monarchy, every one of these  
kingdoms had become Christian. Each had its bishop or  
bishops. Kent had its metropolitan see of Canterbury  
and the bishopric of Rochester; Essex, London; East  
Anglia, Dunwich, afterwards under Archbishop Theodorus  
Elmham, removed later to Norwich: late-converted Sussex  
had Selsey; Wessex, Winchester, afterwards also Sher-  
burn. The great kingdom of Mercia at first was subject  
to the single Bishop of Lichfield; Leicester, Worcester,  
Hereford, and Sidmanchester in Lindesay were severed  
from that vast diocese. The province of York, according  
to Archbishop Theodorus' scheme, was to comprehend  
York, Hexham, and Lindisfarne; Hexham fell in the  
Danish invasions; Lindisfarne removed to Durham; a  
see at Ripon saw but one bishop; the modern bishopric  
of Carlisle may be considered the successor of the bishopric  
of Whitherne in Galloway. Above these rose the Me-

tropolitan of Canterbury; after some struggle for its independence that of York. As in all the Teutonic kingdoms the hierarchy became a co-ordinate <sup>A.D. 785.</sup> aristocracy, as representatives of the nation, taking their seats in the witenagemote,<sup>o</sup> counsellors of the king as great territorial lords, sitting later as nobles with the earls, as magistrates with the ealdermen. Besides their share in the national councils, as a separate body they hold their own synods, in which they enact laws for all their Christian subjects—at Hertford, at Hatfield, at Cloveshoo (probably near Tewkesbury. Cloveshoo was appointed as the place of meeting for an annual synod), later at Calcuith, supposed to be in Kent. Peaceful monasteries arise in all quarters; monasteries in the strict sense, and also conventual establishments, in which the clergy dwell together, and from their religious centres radiate around and disseminate Christianity through the land. Each great church, certainly each cathedral, had its monastery, the priests of which were not merely the officiating clergy of the church, but the missionaries in all the surrounding districts. Christianity became the law of the land, the law underwent the influence of Christianity. The native Teutonic religion, except in a few usages and superstitions, has absolutely disappeared; the heathen Danes, when they arrive, find no vestige of their old kindred faith in tribes sprung not many centuries from the same Teutonic races. The Roman arts, which the fierce and savage Jutes and Angles had obliterated from the land, revive in another form; besides the ecclesiastical Latin, a Teutonic literature has begun; the German bards have become Christian poets. No sooner has Anglo-Saxon Britain become one (no doubt her religious unity must have contributed, if imperceptibly, yet in a great degree to her national unity) than she takes her place among the confederation of European kingdoms.

<sup>o</sup> As in all the Teutonic kingdoms, the province of the Witan, or parliament, and the synod were by no means distinctly comprehended or defined. The great

national council, the Witan, in its sovereign capacity, passed laws on ecclesiastical subjects; the synods at least occasionally trenched on the civil laws.

## CHAPTER V.

## CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACES BEYOND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

WHILE the early Christianity of these islands retired before the Saxon conquerors to Wales, to the Scottish Hebrides, and to Ireland, and looked on the heathen invaders as hopeless and irreclaimable Pagans, beyond the pale of Christian charity, and from whom it was a duty, the duty of irreconcilable hatred, to withhold the Gospel, that faith was flowing back upon the continent of Europe in a gentle but almost continuous tide. In Anglo-Saxon England it was only after a century, that, on the invitation of the Northumbrian king already converted by Roman missionaries, the monks from Iona, and from some, perhaps, of the Irish monasteries, left their solitudes, and commenced their mission of love.

But already, even before the landing of Augustine in England, an Irish monk has found his way to the continent, and is commencing the conversion of German tribes in a region, if within the older frontier of the Roman territory, reduced again to the possession of heathen Teutonic tribes: and from that time out of these islands go forth the chief apostles of Germany. Columban is the forerunner, by at least a century, of the holy Boniface.\*

It is difficult to conceive the motives which led forth these first pious wanderers from their native land. Columban, at his outset, was no missionary, urged by a passionate or determined zeal to convert Pagan nations to the Cross of Christ; nor was he a pilgrim, lured forth from his retreat by the unconquerable desire of visiting the scenes of apostolic labours, the spiritual won-

\* Columban lived at the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century.

ders of Rome, or to do homage to the relics of Saints or Apostles. He and his followers seemed only to seek a safe retreat, in which he might shroud his solitary devotion; or, if his ascetic fame should gather around him an increasing number of disciples, form a cœnobitic establishment. They might have found, it might be supposed, retirement not less secure against secular intrusion, as wild, as silent, as holy, in the yet peaceful Ireland, or in the Scottish islands, as in the mountains of the Vosges, or the valleys of the Alps.

But the influence of Columban, as the parent of so many important monasteries on the borders and within the frontier of Teutonic Paganism, as well as the reverence with which his holy character was invested, and which enabled him to assert the moral dignity of Christianity with such intrepidity, are events, which strongly mark the religious history of this age. The stranger monk issues from his retreat to rebuke the vices of kings, confronts the cruel Brunehaut, and such is the fearful sanctity which environs the man of God, that even her deadly hostility can venture nothing beyond his banishment.

Columban was born in Leinster, at the period when Ireland is described as a kind of Hesperian <sup>His birth.</sup> elysium of peace and piety. His early aspirations after monastic holiness were fostered in the convent of Banchor, on the coast of Ulster. He became a proficient in the mystic piety of the day. But he was suddenly seized with the desire of foreign travel; he wrung an unwilling consent to his departure from his spiritual father, Comgal, abbot of Banchor. He just touched on, but shrunk from the contaminated shores of Paganised Britain, and landed in Gaul. The fame of his piety reached the ears of one of the kings of the land: all that Columban requested was permission to retire into some unapproachable wilderness.

The woody mountains of the Vosges rose on the frontiers of the kingdoms of Austrasia and of Burgundy. <sup>In Alsace.</sup> Tribes of Pagan Suevians then occupied that part of Switzerland which bordered on those king-

<sup>b</sup> Mabillon, Ann. Benedict., vol. i. p. 191.

doms. War and devastation had restored as solitudes to nature districts which had been reclaimed to culture and fertility by the industry of Roman colonists. It was on the site of ancient towns that hermits now found their wildernesses. Columban, with his twelve followers, first settled among the ruins of a small town called Anegratis. The woods yielded herbs and roots and the bark of trees for food, the streams water and probably fish. But the offerings of piety were not wanting; provisions were sent by those who were desirous of profiting by the prayers of these holy men. But the heart of Columban yearned for still more profound solitude. In the depths of the wild woods, about seven miles off, as he wandered with his book, he found a cave, of which the former inhabitant, a bear, gave up quiet possession to the saint—for the wild beasts, wolves as well as bears, and the Pagan Suevians, respected the man of God. Miracle as usual arose around the founder of a monastery. The fame of the piety and wonder-working powers of Columban gathered a still increasing number of votaries; the ruins of Anegratis could no longer contain the candidates for the monastic life.

About eight miles distant lay the more extensive ruins of a fortified Roman town, Luxovium,<sup>c</sup> now overgrown with the wild forest jungle, but formerly celebrated for its warm springs. Amid the remains of splendid baths and other stately buildings, Columban determined to establish a more regular monastery. The forest around is said to have been strewn with marble statues, and magnificent vestiges of the old Pagan worship. On this wreck of heathenism rose the monastery of Luxeuil. Neophytes crowded from all parts; the nobles of the court threw off their arms, or fled from the burthensome duties of civil life to this holy retreat. A second establishment became necessary, and in a beautiful spot, watered by several

\* "Invenitque castrum firmissimo munimine olim fuisse cultum, a supradicto loco distans plus minus octo millibus quem prisca tempora Luxovium appellabant: ibique aquæ calidæ cultu eximio exstructæ habebantur. Ibi ima-

ginum lapidearum densitas vicinos saltus densabat, quas cultu miserabili rituque profano vetusta paganorum templa honorabant."—Jonas, Vit. Columb., c. 9.

streams, rose the succursal abbey of Fontaines. Columban presided as abbot over all these institutions; his delight was ever to wander alone in the woods, or to dwell for days in his lonely cave: but he still exercised strict superintendence over all the monasteries of the Rule which he had formed; he mingled in and encouraged their useful labours in husbandry, it was thought, with more than human wisdom and sagacity.

But peace was not to be found even in the lonely forests of the Vosges. After twelve years of undisturbed repose, religious disputes invaded the quiet shades of Luxeuil. Columban was arraigned before a synod of Gaulish bishops for his heterodox usage about keeping Easter, in which he adhered to the old British discipline. Columban answered with a kind of pathetic dignity, "I am not the author of this difference. I came as a stranger to this land for the sake of our common Lord and Saviour Christ. I beseech you by that common Lord who shall judge us all, to allow me to live in silence, in peace, and in charity, as I have lived for twelve years, beside the bones of my seventeen departed brethren. Let Gaul receive into her bosom all those who, if they deserve it, will be received into the kingdom of heaven."

Columban had to wage a nobler strife against the vices of the neighbouring court. The famous Brunehaut had fled from the kingdom of the elder of her royal grand-children, Theodebert of Austrasia, and taken refuge with the younger, Thierry, King of Burgundy. She ruled the realm by the ascendancy of that strong and unscrupulous mind which for above forty years had raised her into a rival of that more famous Fredegonde, her rival in the number of her paramours, and the number of murders which she had perpetrated.<sup>d</sup> She ruled the king through his vices. Thierry had degenerated, like the rest of the race of Clovis, from the old Teutonic virtues, and plunged head-

Dispute with  
Gaulish  
bishops.

Queen  
Brunehaut  
and King  
Thierry.

A.D. 566-606.

<sup>d</sup> It was not till 613 that she met with a death horrible as her own crimes: exposed on a camel to the derision of the camp of her enemy, King Chlotaire, she was tied to the tail of a wild horse, and

literally torn to shreds.—H. Martin, p. 169. What wonder that in such days men sought refuge in the wilderness, and almost adored hermits like Columban!

long into Roman licence. In vain his subjects had attempted to wean him from his countless mistresses by a marriage with the daughter of the Visigothic king. Neglected, mortified, persecuted by the arts of Brunehaut, the unhappy princess returned to her home. Already Brunehaut had resisted the remonstrances of Didier, Bishop of Vienne, who had rebuked the incontinence of Thierri, and his ill-usage of his wife. Didier was murdered on his road from Lyons to Vienne. The fame of Columban induced Thierri to visit his saintly retirement. Columban seized the opportunity to reproach him for his adulteries, and to persuade him that the safety of his realm depended on his having a legitimate heir. Thierri listened with awe to the man of God; he promised to act according to his wise counsels. Even Brunehaut, the murderer of bishops, dared not lay her hand on him. Brunehaut saw her power in danger. Whether she sought the interview in the vain hope of softening him by her blandishments, or whether he came of his own accord, Columban visited the queen in her palace. The stern virtue of the saint was not to be moved. Brunehaut approached him, and entreated his blessing on two illegitimate sons of Thierri: the benediction of the saint seems to have had some connexion with their hopes of succession to the throne; to which, according to Frankish usage, legitimacy was not indispensable. "These bastards, born in sin," replied Columban, "shall never inherit the kingdom." He passed away unmolested through the awe-struck court. Brunehaut began a petty and vexatious warfare, by cutting off the supplies from the monasteries, and stirring up jealousies with other neighbouring convents. Either to remonstrate, or to avert the royal anger, Columban again approached the court, then held at the village of Epaisses,\* but he refused to enter under the roof. Thierri ordered a royal banquet to be prepared and sent out to the saint at the door. "It is written," said Columban, "that God abhors the offerings of the wicked; his servants must not be polluted with food given by those

\* The villa Brocarica, Bourchesse. —H. Martin, *Histoire de la France*, between Châlons, and Autun. ii. 160.

who persecute his saints." He dashed the wine on the earth, and scattered about the other viands. The affrighted king again promised amendment, but abstained not from his notorious adulteries. Columban then addressed to him a letter, in which he lashed his vices with unsparing severity, and threatened him with excommunication.<sup>f</sup> The king could bear no more; he appealed to his nobles, he appealed to his bishops, knowing no doubt their jealousy of the stranger monk and their dislike of some of his usages. He demanded free ingress and egress for his servants into the monastery. Columban haughtily replied, "that if he dared thus to infringe the monastic rule, his kingdom would fall, and his whole race be cut off." When Thierry himself attempted to enter the refectory, he shrunk before the intrepid demeanour and terrible language of the abbot. Yet with some shrewdness he observed, "Do not think that I will gratify your pride by making you a martyr." To a sentence of banishment the stranger monk replied, that he would not be driven from his monastery but by force. At length a man was found Columban banished. who did not quail before the saint. Columban was arrested, and carried to Besançon; but even there his guards, from awe, performed their duty so negligently that he escaped and returned to Luxeuil. Again he was seized, not without difficulty, and carried off amid the lamentations of his faithful followers. Two or three Irish monks alone were permitted to accompany him. He was hurried in rude haste towards Nantes; at Orleans he was not allowed to enter the church, hardly permitted to visit the shrine of St. Martin at Tours; and embarked on board a vessel bound to Ireland.

During all this journey the harsh usage of the royal officers was mitigated by the wondering reverence Journey through France. of the people: it is described as a continued scene of miracle. The language attributed to Columban by his admiring biographer shows not only the privilege assumed by the monastic saints of that day, of dispensing with the humble tone of meekness and charity, but also the fearless equality, or rather superiority, with which a foreign monk

<sup>f</sup> Jonas describes the letter as "verberibus plenas."

thus addresses the kings of the land. "Why are you retiring hitherward?" said the Bishop of Tours. "Because that dog Thierrî has driven me away from my brethren." To another he said, "Tell thy friend Thierrî that within three years he and his children shall perish, and God will root up his whole race." In those days such prophecies concerning one of the royal families of the Franks was almost sure of its fulfilment.

Columban was justified in the estimation of men, even of kings, in taking this lofty tone. The vessel in which he was embarked was cast back on the coast of Return to France. Neustria. The King Clothaire II. humbly solicited the saint to hallow his kingdom by making it his residence. Columban declined the offer, and passed into Austrasia, where King Theodebert received him with the same respectful deference.

The monks from Luxeuil flocked around their beloved master; but Columban declined likewise the urgent entreaties of Theodebert to bless his kingdom by the establishment of a monastery. He yearned for wilder solitudes. With his followers he went to Moguntiacum (Mentz), and embarked upon the Rhine. They worked their way up the stream till they reached the mouth of the Limmat, and followed that river into the lake of Zurich. From the shores of the lake they went by land to Tugium (the Zug. modern Zug). Around them were the barbarous heathen Suevians. Columban and his disciples

had little of the gentle and winning perseverance of missionaries; they had been accustomed to dictate to trembling sovereigns. Their haughty and violent demeanour, which overawed those who had been brought up in Christianity, provoked the Pagans, instead of weaning them from their idolatries. A strange tale is told of a huge vat of beer, offered to the god Woden, which burst at the mere breath of Columban. St. Gall, his companion,<sup>s</sup> set their temples on fire, and threw their idols into the lake. The monks were compelled to fly; and Columban left the Pagans of that district with a most unapostolic maledic-

<sup>s</sup> The history of St. Gall is related in more than one form in Pertz, tom. ii. p. 1-34.

tion, devoting their whole race to temporal misery and eternal perdition.<sup>b</sup> They retreated to Arbon, on the lake of Constance; there, from a Christian priest, named Willimar, they heard of a ruined Roman city at the end of the lake, named Brigetium (Bregenz). There Columban found a ruined church dedicated to St. Aurelia, which he rebuilt. But the chief objects of worship in the re-Paganised land were three statues of gilded brass. St. Gall preached to the people in their own language, and then broke their idols in pieces, and threw them into the water: part of his hearers applauded, but some departed in undisguised anger.

In this remote spot they built their monastery. St. Gall was a skilful fisherman, and supplied the brethren with fresh fish from the lake. One silent night, when he was fishing, he heard (it is said), from the highest peak, the voice of the Spirit of the Mountains calling on the Spirit of the Waters in the depth of the lake. "I am here," was the reply. "Arise, then, to mine aid against these strangers who have cast me from my temple; let us expel them from the land." "One of them is even now busied in my waters, but I cannot break his nets, for I am rebuked by the prevailing name, in which he is perpetually praying."<sup>i</sup>

The human followers of the Pagan deities were not so easily controlled. After two or three years the monks found a confederacy formed against them, at the head of which was a neighbouring chieftain, the savage Cunzo.<sup>k</sup> Columban determined to retire. He had some thoughts of attempting the conversion of the Slavi and the Veneti; but an angel, perhaps the approach of age, admonished him to seek a quiet retreat in Italy. He was honourably received by Agilulf, King of Lombardy. After some time

<sup>b</sup> "Fiant nati eorum in interitum; ergo ad mediam ætatem cum pervenerint stupor ac dementia eos apprehendant, ita ut alieno ære oppressi, ignominiam suam agnoscant conversi."—Vita S. Galli, apud Pertz, ii. p. 7.

<sup>i</sup> This story is too picturesque and striking to be omitted. It is characteristic, too, to find the sights and sounds which the Greeks would have attributed

to divinities, turned into malignant spirits. Two naked girls were bathing in a stream in which St. Gall was fishing. Of old they would have passed for nymphs; with him they were devils in that enticing shape. Sounds which they hear on the mountains, when catching hawks, are voices of devils.

<sup>k</sup> Cunzo's daughter is said to have been betrothed to King Thierri.

spent in literary labours, in confutation of the Arianism which still lingered in that part of Italy, he founded the famous monastery of Bobbio.<sup>1</sup>

St. Gall, from real or simulated illness, remained behind. He withdrew with his boat and fishing nets to Arbon; he was accompanied by some of the Irish monks, and in that neighbourhood founded the monastery, not less celebrated, which bore his name.

Thus these Irish monks were not merely reinvigorating the decaying monastic spirit, which perhaps was languishing from the extreme severity of the rule of Cas-  
Founders of monasteries. sianus, chiefly followed in the monasteries of Gaul, but they were winning back districts which had been won from Roman civilisation by advancing barbarism. Monasteries replace ruined Roman cities. From them issued almost a race of saints, the founders of some of the most important establishments within or on the borders of the old Roman territory: Magnus and Theodorus, the first abbots of Kempten and of Fussen; Attalus of Bobbio; St. Romaric of Remiremont; St. Omer, St. Bertin, St. Amand, the apostles of Flanders; St. Wandrille, the founder of Fontenelle, in Normandy.<sup>m</sup> Gradually the great establishments, founded on the rule of Columban, dropped the few peculiarities of discipline which distinguished them from the Roman Church; they retained those of their rule, which differed from that which was now beginning to prevail throughout western Christendom. Yet there was nothing of great importance to distinguish them from the Benedictine foundations; their rule, habits, studies (all, perhaps, but their dress) were those of western monasticism.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I follow the early life of St. Gall in Pertz, from which was derived that of Walafrid Strabo. Jonas, the biographer of Columban, represents him as still persecuted by Brunehaut and Thierry, who may indeed have excited the confederacy against him. Jonas also carries Columban back to the court of Theodebert, King of Austrasia, whom, when in the height of his power, he endeavours to persuade to take the clerical habit. "When was it heard," was the indignant reply, "that a Merovingian on

the throne stooped to become a clerk?" "If you become not one voluntarily," said the prophetic monk, "you will so by compulsion!" Theodebert afterwards, defeated by Brunehaut and the King of Burgundy, was forced to take orders, and then put to death. The history probably produced the prophecy. — Jonas, c. 27.

<sup>m</sup> Michelet, *Hist. de France*, i. 275.

<sup>n</sup> Mabillon, *Hist. Ordin. Benedict.*, i. p. 195.

Columban and his immediate followers had hardly extended the influence of Christianity beyond the borders of the old Roman empire. But, important English missionaries. as outposts on the verge of Christendom, or even in districts which had reverted to barbarism, gradually encircling themselves with an enlarging belt of cultivation and of Christianity, they were only thus gradually and indirectly aggressive. Another century had nearly elapsed when the Apostle of Germany came forth from a different part of the British Isles. Those Saxon conquerors whom Columban, when he touched the shores of Britain, left behind as irreclaimable heathens, had now become Christians from one end of the land to the other. In their turn they were to send out their saintly and more adventurous missionaries into their native German forests. Wilfrid of York had already made some progress in the conversion of the Frisians on the lower part of the Rhine; but almost all beyond the Rhine, when Boniface undertook the conversion of Germany, was the undisputed domain of the old Teutonic idolatry.

Boniface (his proper Saxon name was Winfrid) was born near Crediton, in Devonshire. From his infancy he is said to have displayed a disposition S. Boniface. to singular piety; and in his youth the influence of his father could not repress his inclination to the monastic life. The father, alarmed by a dangerous illness, yielded to the wishes of the boy, who was received into a monastery at Exeter; afterwards he moved to Netley. Having completed his studies, he was ordained priest at thirty; and a confidential mission on which he was employed between a synod of the clergy and the Archbishop Berchtwald shows the estimation in which he was already held. But Boniface was eager for the more adventurous life of a missionary. His first enterprise was discouraging, and might have repressed less earnest zeal. With the permission of his superiors he embarked at London, landed on the coast of Friesland, and made his way to Utrecht. But Radbold, King About A.D. 600. of Frisia, at war with one of the Frankish kings, had commenced a fierce persecution of the Christians; everywhere In Friesland. About A.D. 716.

he had destroyed the churches, and rebuilt the temples. Boniface found his eloquence wasted on the stubborn heart of the pagan, and returned to England.

But his spirit was impatient of repose. He determined to visit Rome, perhaps to obtain the sanction of the head of Western Christendom for new attempts to propagate the Gospel in Germany. He crossed the sea to Normandy, and with a multitude of other pilgrims journeyed through France, paying his adorations in all the more famous churches; escaped the dangers of the snowy Alps, the Lombards, who treated him with unexpected humanity, and the predatory soldiery, which were prowling about in all directions. He found himself, at length, on his knees in the Church of St. Peter. He was received, on the presentation of recommendatory letters from his bishop, with condescending welcome.

The Pope, Gregory II. (our history will revert to the intermediate succession of popes; we are now in the eighth century), entered into all the views of Boniface, and sanctioned his passionate wish to ascertain how far the most savage tribes of Germany would receive the Gospel. Gregory bestowed upon him ample powers, but exacted an oath of allegiance to the Roman see. He recommended him to all the bishops and to all orders of Christians, above all to Charles Martel,<sup>o</sup> who, as mayor of the palace, exercised royal authority in that part of France. He urged Charles to assist the missionary by all means in his power in the pious work of reclaiming the heathen from the state of brute-beasts.<sup>p</sup> And Charles Martel faithfully fulfilled the wishes of the Pope. "Without the protection of the prince of the Franks," writes the grateful Boniface, "I could neither rule the people, nor defend the priests, the monks, and the handmaids of God, nor prevent pagan and idolatrous rites in Germany."<sup>q</sup> The Pope attributes the spiritual subjugation of a hundred thousand barbarians by the holy Boniface to the aid of Charles.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>o</sup> See the letter in which Charles takes him under his mundebund or defence.—Apud Giles, i. 37.

<sup>p</sup> Gregor. II., Epist. iv. v. vi.

<sup>q</sup> Bonifac., Epist. xii., apud Giles, to Daniel, Bishop of Winchester.

<sup>r</sup> Sirmond. Concil. ii. p. 527.

Armed with these powers, and with a large stock of relics, Boniface crossed the Alps and entered into Thuringia. This province was already in part Christian; but their Christianity required much correction (they were probably Arians), and the clergy were in no way disposed to that rigid celibacy now required of their order. Boniface did all in his power, but, notwithstanding the urgent addresses of the Pope himself to the Thuringians, by no means with complete success; they still resisted the monastic discipline. When he left Thuringia he heard of the death of Radbod, the pagan king of Friesland. He immediately embarked on the Rhine, in the hope of renewing, under better auspices, his attempts on that country. For three years he laboured there with great success, as the humble assistant of the Bishop Willibrod. Again the temples fell, and the churches rose. Willibrod felt the approach of age, and desired to secure as his coadjutor, as the future successor to his bishopric, a youthful teacher of so much zeal and wisdom. The humility of Boniface struggled against the offers, the arguments, the earnest entreaties of the Prelate. He pleaded that he was not yet fifty, the canonical age of a bishop. At length he declared that he had been employed on a special service by the Pope to propagate the Gospel in Germany; he had already delayed too long in Friesland; he dared not decline, without the direct mandate of the Pope, his more imperative and arduous duties as a missionary.

Our curiosity, and higher feelings, are vividly excited by the thought of the earliest preachers of Christianity plunging into the unknown depths of the German forests, addressing the Gospel of peace to fierce and warlike tribes, encountering the strange and perhaps appalling superstitions of ages, penetrating into hallowed groves, and standing before altars reeking with human blood.\* We expect the kindling adventure of

*In Thuringia,  
724.*

*In Friesland.*

*Silence of  
Christian  
writers about  
Paganism.*

\* Read (it is however on this subject quite vague) the counsel given to his countrymen, as to the mode of arguing with the heathen, by Daniel, Bishop of Winchester, as seen from his letters, in which he advises Boniface to keep

on good terms even with the wicked clergy of France. It is curious, that he was to contrast the fertile lands of the Christians, flowing with oil and wine, and abounding in wealth, with the cold and dreary deserts left to the

romance to mingle with the quiet and steady course of Christian benevolence and self-sacrifice; at least perpetually to meet with incidents which may throw light on the old Teutonic character, the habits, manners, institutions of the various tribes. The biographers of the saints are in general barren of this kind of information; they rarely enter into details on the nature or the rites of the old religions; they speak of them in one sweeping tone of abhorrence; they condemn the gods under the vague term of idols, or adopt the Roman usage of naming them after the deities of Greece and Rome. On the miracles of their own saints they are diffuse and particular; but on the power, attributes, and worship of the heathen gods, except on a few occasions, they are almost silent. Boniface, Boniface invited to Rome, 122. In Rome, 123. Ordained bishop, 123. it is said, on his first expedition among the Saxons and Hessians, baptized thousands, destroyed the heathen temples, and set up Christian churches. As a faithful servant he communicated his wonderful successes to Rome; he was summoned to the metropolis of Christianity, and, after a profession of faith in the Trinity, which would bear the searching inquisition of Rome,<sup>1</sup> he was raised to the dignity of a bishop. On his return to Germany, Boniface found but few of his Hessian proselytes adhering to pure Christianity. They had made a wild mixture of the two creeds; they still worshipped their sacred groves and fountains; some yet offered sacrifices on their old altars. The wizards and soothsayers still maintained their influence; the trembling worshippers still acknowledged the might of their charms and the truth of their omens.

Boniface determined to strike a blow at the heart of the obstinate Paganism. There was an old and venerable The oak of Geismar. oak,<sup>2</sup> of immense size, in the grove of Geismar, hallowed for ages to the Thunderer. Attended by all his clergy, Boniface went publicly forth to fell this tree. The pagans assembled in multitudes to behold this trial of strength between their ancient gods and the God of

pagans and their gods.—Epist. xiv. i. 48. philas among these new German converts.

<sup>1</sup> This was usual, or we might suppose that they dreaded another Ul-  
<sup>2</sup> Near Fritzlar. The oak is called robur Jovis.

the stranger. They awaited the issue in profound silence. Some, no doubt, expected the axe to recoil on the sacrilegious heads of the Christians. But only a few blows had been struck, when a sudden wind was heard in the groaning branches of the tree, and down it came toppling with its own weight, and split into four huge pieces. The shuddering pagans at once bowed before the superior might of Christianity. Boniface built out of the wood a chapel to St. Peter. After this churches everywhere arose; and here and there a monastery was settled. But the want of labourers was great; and Boniface sent to his native land for a supply of missionaries. A number of active and pious men flocked from England to his spiritual standard; and many devout women obeyed the impulse, and either founded or filled convents, which began to rise in the districts beyond the Rhine. The similarity of language no doubt qualified the English missionaries for their labours among the Teutonic races: Italians had been of no use.

Boniface had won a new empire to Christianity; and was placed over it as spiritual sovereign by the respectful gratitude of the Pope. He received the pall of a Metropolitan, and was empowered as primate to erect bishoprics throughout Germany. Again he visited Rome, and was invested by Gregory III., the new Pope, with full powers as representative of the Apostolic see.

The Metropolitan throne was fixed on the Rhine, at Mentz. This city had formerly been a bishop's see. In the wars of Carloman, the Frank, against the Saxons, the Bishop Gerold went out to battle with his sovereign, and was slain. He was succeeded by his son, Gewelib, a man of strict morals, but addicted to hawks and hounds. Gewelib cherished the sacred hereditary duty of revenging his father's death.\* He discovered the man by whose hand Gerold had fallen, lured him to an amicable interview in an island on the river, and stabbed

Boniface Metropolitan of Mentz.

\* From the Life of Boniface by a presbyter of Mentz.—Pertz, p. 354. *Episcopus autem a cæde regressus, rudi populo, rudis adhuc præsul, licet ætate maturus, tamen fide . . . præficitur;*

*non computantibus nec rege, nec cæteris optimatibus, vindictam patris crimen esse, dicentibusque "Vicem reddidit patris morti."*

him to the heart. Neither king nor nobles thought this just exaction of blood for blood the least disqualification for a Christian bishop. But the Christianity of Boniface was superior to the dominant barbarism. The blood-stained bishop was deposed by the act of a council, and on the vacancy the Metropolitan see erected at Mentz. From his Metropolitan see of Mentz, Boniface ruled Christian Germany with a parental hand. He exercised his power of establishing bishoprics by laying the foundations of some of those wealthy and powerful sees, which long possessed so commanding an influence in Germany. On his return from his third visit to Rome he passed through Bavaria; there he found but one solitary bishopric, at Passau. He founded those of Salzburg, of Freisinghen, and of Ratisbon. In Thuringia the episcopal see was fixed at Erfurt; in Hesse, at Bamberg, which was afterwards removed to Paderborn: for Franconia he founded that of Wurtzburg. Besides these churches, those of Utrecht, Cologne, Tongres, Worms, Spire, Augsburg, Constance, and Coire owned their allegiance to the supremacy with which the Metropolitan of Mentz had been invested by the successor of St. Peter.<sup>7</sup>

Boniface ruled the minds of the clergy, the people, and the kings. He held councils, and condemned heretics: one, an impostor named Adalbert, who pretended to work miracles; the other, Clement, a Scot, who held some unintelligible doctrines on Christ's descent into hell, and on predestination. The obsequious Frankish Sovereign of Neustria, who claimed dominion over the whole of Christian Germany, punished the delinquents with imprisonment. Carloman himself, who had risen from the post of Mayor of the Palace to that of Sovereign, was so wrought on by the pious eloquence of Boniface, that he abandoned his throne, bequeathed his son to the perilous guardianship of his brother Pepin, went to Rome, and retired into a monastery.

Boniface even resisted within his own diocese the author of his greatness. The Pope Stephen, on his visit to

<sup>7</sup> The acts of Boniface in the reformation of the clergy of France will be related in a subsequent chapter.

Pepin, presumed to ordain a Bishop of Metz. Boniface resisted this encroachment, and it was only at the earnest representation of Pepin, who urged the unreasonableness of such a quarrel between the heads of the Church, that the feud was allayed.\*

*Resists the Pope.*

But power and dignity were not the ruling passions of Boniface. He threw off all the pomp and authority of the Primate of Germany to become again the humble apostle. He surrendered his see to Lullus, one of the Englishmen whom he had invited to Germany, and set forth, if not to seek, not to shrink from martyrdom among the savage pagans. He obtained that last glorious crown of his devoted life. In Friesland he had made numerous converts; the day was appointed on which he was to administer the rite of confirmation to a multitude of these neophytes. The morn had begun to dawn on the open country where the tents had been pitched, when they were suddenly attacked by a band of armed heathens. The converts of Boniface rose up in self defence, but the saint discouraged their vain efforts, and exhorted them to submit in peace and joy to their heaven-appointed martyrdom. All met their doom; but their assailants quarrelled about the spoil; made themselves drunk with the wine, and so fell upon each other, and revenged the Christian martyrs. The body of St. Boniface was conveyed to the monastery of Fulda.

*Death of Boniface. A.D. 754.*

This renowned monastery had owed its foundation to Boniface. These great conventual establishments were of no less importance in German history than the bishoprics. The history of Fulda illustrates the manner in which these advanced posts of Christianity

*Monasteries. Fulda.*

\* There is something remarkable in the simplicity with which Boniface remonstrates against certain unchristian practices at Rome. He asks Pope Zacharias if it can be true that heathen usages, such as feasts at the kalends of January, phylacteries worn by the women, enchantments and divinations, are allowed at Rome. He even ventures on one occasion to make more delicate inquiries as to simoniacal practices, especially that of selling metropolitan palls.

"Quod talia a te nobis referantur, quasi nos corruptores sumus canonum, et patrum rescindere traditiones queramus, ac per hoc, quod abest, cum nostris clericis in simoniacam hæresim incidamus, accipientes et compellentes, ut hi quibus pallia tribuimus, nobis præmia largiantur."—Zachariæ Epist. ad Bonifac. Labbe, Conc. "Non oportet ut qui caput ecclesiæ estis, cæteris membris exempla contentionis præbeatis."—Vit. Bonifac. apud Pertz, vol. ii. p. 336.

and civilisation were settled in the midst of the deep Teutonic forests.

Sturmi was the son of noble Christian parents in Noricum; the enthusiasm of youthful piety led him to follow Boniface into Germany. He was ordained priest, and laboured successfully under the guidance of his master. He was seized with the dominant passion for the monastic state; and Boniface encouraged rather than repressed his ardour. With a few companions he entered into the forest solitude, and fixed at first at Hertzfeld. But this retirement was at once too near the frontier and exposed to danger from the pagan Saxons. Boniface urged them to strike deeper into the wilderness. Though their impulse was so different, their adventures resemble those of the backwoodsmen in America, exploring the unknown forests. They tracked in their boats along some of the rivers; but their fastidious piety, and, not perhaps altogether unworldly, sagacity, could find no place which united all the requisites for a flourishing monastery; profound seclusion, salubrious and even beautiful situation, fertile soil, abundant water.\* With the tone, and, in their belief, with the authority of a prophet, Boniface declared, on their report, that the chosen site would be revealed at length. Sturmi set out alone upon an ass, and with a small stock of food plunged fearlessly into the wilderness. He beguiled the way with psalms, at the same time he surveyed the country with a keen and curious observation. At night he lit a circular fire, to scare away the wild beasts, and lay down in the midst of it. His ass was one day startled by a number of wild Sclavonians bathing in a stream, and the saint perceived the offensive smell which proceeded from them.<sup>b</sup> They mocked him, probably by their gestures, but did him no harm. At length he arrived at a spot on the banks of the Fulda, where he was so delighted with the

\* "Tunc avidus locorum explorator ubique sagaci obtutu montuosa atque plana perlustrans loca, montes quoque et colles vallesque adspiciens, fontes et torrentes atque fluvios perlustrans, pergebat."—*Vita S. Sturmii*, Pertz, ii. 368.

<sup>b</sup> "Et ipse vir Dei eorum fœtorem exporruit." This seems to be meant literally,

though the words which follow, "qui more Gentilium servum Dei subsannabant," might perhaps lead to another sense. If I am right in my translation, it is a curious illustration of the antipathy of races.—*Apud Pertz*, *ibid.*

situation, the soil, the water, that having passed the whole day in exploring it, he determined that this must be the site predicted by Boniface. He returned to his companions. Boniface not merely approved of the choice, but also obtained a grant of the site, with a demesne extending four miles each way, from the pious Carloman, who, whatever his own title, gave it to God with as much facility as lands are now granted in Canada or Australia. Boniface himself went to visit the place, and watched the clearing of the forest and the preparations for building with unfailing interest. The monks of Fulda adopted the rule of St. Benedict; the multitude of candidates for admission was so great, that accommodation could not be found fast enough. Of all the gifts of Boniface, the most valuable was that of his body, which refused to repose anywhere but in the abbey of Fulda.

The abbots of Fulda were not perpetually employed in the peaceful and legitimate Christian Apostleship of Boniface for the conversion of Germany: at a later period they were summoned to attend Charlemagne on his Mohammedan mission for the conversion of the heathen Saxons by the sword. On his first campaign, the aged Sturmi was one of the flock of bishops, and abbots, and clergy who followed in the train of war.

England, meantime, had been still supplying the more peaceful warriors of the Cross, who endeavoured in vain by preaching the Gospel to subdue the fierce and exasperated Saxons. Willibald, the Apostle of Friesland, was a Northumbrian. Adalbert, Bishop of Utrecht, and Leofwin, who was martyred by the Saxons, with many others, came from our island. St. Ludger, though a Frisian by descent, had studied under Alcuin at York.<sup>c</sup> In this singular manner the Anglo-Saxon invasion of England flowed back upon the continent; and Gregory the Great, by his conversion of England, gave the remote impulse to the conversion of large parts of Germany.

• Vita S. Ludgeri, printed in Bede's works.

## CHAPTER VI.

THE PAPACY FROM THE TIME OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO  
GREGORY II.

	A.D.		A.D.
Gregory the Great, died . . . . .	604	Adeodatus . . . . .	672
Sabinianus . . . . .	604, 606	Domnus . . . . .	677
Boniface III. . . . .	607	Agatho . . . . .	679
Boniface IV. . . . .	608	Leo II. . . . .	682
Deusdedit . . . . .	615, 618	Benedict. . . . .	684
Boniface V. . . . .	618, 625	John V. . . . .	685
Honorius I. . . . .	625, 638	Conon . . . . .	686
Severinus (2 months and 4 days) . . . . .	639	Sergius . . . . .	687, 701
John IV. . . . .	640	John VI. . . . .	702
Theodorus I. . . . .	642	John VII. . . . .	705, 707
Martin I. . . . .	649, 655	Sisinnus . . . . .	708
Eugenius I. . . . .	654	Constantine . . . . .	708
Vitalianus . . . . .	657	Gregory II. . . . .	716

ALL these conquests of Christianity were, in a certain sense, the conquests of the Roman See. Augustine had been a Roman missionary, and though the ancient British Church had raised up something of an intractable spirit in some of the English kingdoms, and passing to the continent with Columban and his followers, had asserted some independence, and for a time had maintained usages which refused to conform to the Roman discipline, yet reverence for Rome penetrated with the Gospel to the remotest parts. Germany was converted to Latin Christianity; Rome was the source, the centre, the regulating authority recognised by the English apostles of the Teutons. The clergy were constantly visiting Rome as the religious capital of the world, to do homage to the head of Western Christendom, to visit the shrines of the apostles, the more devout to obtain relics, the more intellectual knowledge, letters, arts. The Pontificate of Gregory the Great had been the epoch at which had commenced at least both this great extension of Latin Christianity, and the independence of the Roman See. But the impulse had been much stronger towards the subjugation of these new dominions, than towards emancipation from the secular

The Teutons  
converted to  
Latin Chris-  
tianity.

Popes subor-  
dinate to the  
Eastern  
Emperors.

power of the Eastern emperors. While the Papal influence was thus spreading in the West, and bishops from the remotest parts of the empire, and of regions never penetrated by the Roman arms, looked to Rome as the parent of their faith,—if not to an infallible, at least to the highest authority in Christendom—the Pope, in his relation to the Eastern empire, has sunk again into a subject. He is the pontiff of a city within a conquered province, that province arbitrarily governed by an officer of the sovereign. He is consecrated only after the permission of the Emperor, is expected to obey the imperial mandate even on religious matters, exposed to penalties for contumacy, in one case arrested, exiled, and with difficulty saved from capital punishment.

In the century, or but few years more, after the death of Gregory the Great, down to the accession of Gregory II.,<sup>a</sup> a rapid succession of twenty-four Successors of Gregory I. popes filled the Apostolic See. Few of them stand forth out of the obscurity of the times. The maintenance rather than the growth of the papal power is to be ascribed more to the circumstances of the age than to the character or ability of the popes. Many of them were of Roman, most of Italian birth; few, even if they had been greater men, ruled long enough to achieve any great acts. Two of those, whose reign was most protracted, were distinguished, the one, Honorius I. only for his errors; the other, Martin, for his misfortunes.

Sabinianus, the successor of Gregory, has the character of a hard and avaricious man. He was a native Sabinianus. A.D. 604. Sept. 13. of Volterra, and had been employed as the envoy and representative of Gregory at Constantinople.<sup>b</sup> The admirers of Gregory describe Sabinianus as a bitter enemy to the fame of his holy predecessor. Gregory's unbounded liberality to the poor, Sabinianus reproached as a prodigal waste of the treasures of the Church, a vain ostentation, a low art to obtain popularity. A dreadful famine followed the accession of the new pontiff: he sold the corn, which Gregory was wont to distribute freely, at

<sup>a</sup> Gregory the Great died 604. Gregory II. Pope 716.

<sup>b</sup> The Apocrisiarius was the title of the papal envoy at the Byzantine court.

exorbitant prices;° and laid the fault of the parsimony, to which he said that he was compelled, on the prodigality of Gregory. But the people, some of whom are said to have perished with hunger before the eyes of the un pitying pope, could not comprehend what might have been necessary, or even wise economy.

But Sabinianus seems to have struck on a chord of popular Roman feeling, which answered more readily to his touch. The populace listened greedily to the charge, first said to have been made by Sabinianus, of the wanton destruction made by the late pope of the public buildings, and other monuments of the city. Gregory was accused as having defaced with systematic Christian iconoclasm, and demolished the ancient temples, and of having thrown down and broken to pieces the statues which still adorned the city.<sup>d</sup> The revenge suggested by the malice of Sabinianus was the public destruction of the works of Gregory. The pious mendacity of Peter the Deacon, as it had saved the mortal remains of his master from insult, now protected his works. He assured the populace that himself had seen the Holy Ghost, in the shape of a dove, whispering into the ear of Gregory. Whatever be the truth of these old traditions, they betray the existence of two unscrupulous hostile factions, one adoring, the other bitterly persecuting the fame of Gregory; and exhibit a singular, yet not unnatural, state of feeling in the Roman populace. The old Roman attachment to their majestic

° 30 solidi a bushel.

<sup>d</sup> Platina (de Vit. Pontif.) connects these two rumours. The iconoclasm of which Gregory is accused has given rise to a long controversy. Platina indignantly rejects the charge of wantonly destroying the public edifices, and assigns very probable reasons for their decay. "Absit hæc calumnia a tanto Pontifice Romano, præsertim cui certè post Deum patria quam vita charior fuit. Multa profecto ex collapsis ædificiis exedit vetustas. Multa præterea demoliuntur homines ædificandi gratiâ, ut *quotidie* cernimus. Impacta illa foramina, quæ tum in concavo fornicum, tum in conjuncturis marmorum, quadratorumve lapidum videntur, non minus a Romanis

quam a barbaris avellendi særis causâ crediderim. In fornicibus enim, quo levior esset moles, ollas cum numismatibus collocabant. Lapidibus vero quadratos æneis clavis firmabant." The statues, he proceeds, fell of themselves, their marble or bronze pedestals being objects of plunder. The heads, the necks being the slenderest part, were knocked off in the fall. This is in answer to the accusation that Gregory caused the statues to be beheaded. I am not sure that Gregory's more religious contemporaries would have thought these charges calumnious: the period was not passed when the hatred of idolatry would predominate over the love of art.

edifices, and even to the stately images of their ancient gods, is struggling successfully against their Christian reverence for their pontiff, but yielding to the most credulous Christian superstition. Superstition triumphed the more easily over a hard and avaricious prelate; and, on the Pope's refusal to allow the sainted Gregory the quiet enjoyment of Christian peace in heaven, brought him down to punish his guilty successor, and avenge his own wrongs. Thrice Gregory appeared to rebuke Sabinianus—thrice he appeared in vain; the fourth time the spirit struck the pontiff a violent blow on the head, of which he died. So exasperated were the people against Sabinianus, that his funeral procession was conducted by a long circuit without the city, from the Lateran palace to St. Peter's, to escape the insults of the Romans.

A.D. 606.  
Feb. 22, to  
A.D. 607,  
Feb. 19.\*

A vacancy of nearly a year ensued after the death of Sabinianus. The brief pontificate of Boniface III. is marked by the assumption of that awful title

Boniface III.

before which Christendom bowed for so many centuries, that of Universal Bishop. The pious humility of Gregory had shuddered at the usurpation of this title by the Patriarch of Constantinople. No language could express the devout abhorrence of this impious, heretical, diabolic, anti-Christian assertion of superiority. Boniface then represented the pope at the Imperial Court, and succeeded not merely in wresting this title from the rival prelate of Constantinople, but in obtaining an acknowledgment of the supremacy of St. Peter's successor.<sup>†</sup> Neither the motive of the donor of this magnificent privilege, nor the donor himself, commend the gift. It was the tyrant Phocas, who hated the Patriarch of Constantinople for his humanity, in protecting, as far as he had power, the widow and the three helpless daughters of the murdered emperor Maurice from his vengeance; and this hatred of the Patriarch of

\* I would observe that in many of these dates, it is that of the consecration and burial which are recorded, not the accession and death of the Pope.

† The early authorities for this fact are Anastasius Bibliothecarius in Vit. Bonifac. IV., and Paulus Diaconus, Hist. Longobard. Schroëck (Chr. Kirch.

Gesch., xvii. 73, and xix. 488) is disposed to question the whole, to which perhaps too much importance has been given by modern controversialists. Baronius and Pagi have added, without any authority, that Phocas forbade the Patriarch of Constantinople to call himself Universal Bishop.

Constantinople, rather than the higher respect for the Bishop of Rome, still less any mature deliberation on the justice of their respective claims, awarded the superiority to the old Rome. On the death of Phocas the Patriarch of Constantinople resumed, if he had ever abandoned, the contested title.

Even greater obscurity hangs over the decision of a synod held by Boniface at Rome, which is thought to have invested the papal see in more substantial and immediate power. Seventy-two bishops, thirty-three presbyters, and the whole assembled clergy, passed a canon that, under the penalty of anathema, no one should form a party for the succession to a bishopric; three days were to elapse before the election, and all bribery and simoniacal bargaining were strictly forbidden. No election was to be good unless made by the clergy and people, and ratified by the prince. A later and more doubtful authority subjoins, not till approved by the pope, under the solemn form. "We will and we ordain."<sup>b</sup>

Boniface IV., a Marsian, is celebrated for the conversion of the Pantheon into a Christian Church. With the sanction of the emperor, this famous temple, in which were assembled all the gods of the Roman world, was purified and dedicated to the new tutelar deities of mankind, the Virgin, and all the martyrs.

Deusdedit and Boniface V. occupied the papal throne for ten years of peace, unbroken by any hostile collision, either with the Exarch or the Lombard kings, and even undisturbed by any important controversy.

But the fatal connexion with the Eastern empire drove the succeeding popes into the intricacies and feuds of a new theological strife. While Mohammedanism was gathering in her might on its borders, and the stern assertors of the Divine Unity had already begun to wrest provinces from the Roman empire, the bishops in all the great sees of the East, the emperors themselves, were dis-

<sup>b</sup> This sentence rests only on the late and doubtful authority of Platina, in Vit. Pontif.

tracting their own minds, persecuting their subjects, and even spreading strife and bloodshed through their cities on the question of the single or the double Will in Christ. Honorius I. incurred a condemnation for heresy, Honorius I. his more orthodox successors suffered persecution, and one of them exile and death.

It might have been supposed that Nestorianism, with its natural offspring, Eutychianism, had exhausted or worn out the contest concerning the union of the Godhead and the manhood in the Saviour. Controversy about the two wills in Christ. The Church had asserted the co-existence of the two natures—man with all his perfect properties—God with all His perfect attributes: it had refused to keep them in almost antagonistic separation with the Nestorian—to blend them into one with Eutyches. The Nestorian and the Monophysite had been alike driven away from the high places of the Church; though still formidable sects, they were but sects.

But the Godhead and the manhood, thus each distinct and complete in itself, yet so intimately conjoined—where began the divergence? where closed the harmony? Did the will, not merely the consentient, but absolutely identical will, and one unconflicting operation of that will, having become an active energy, perform all the works of the Redeemer, submit to and undergo his passion? or did each nature preserve its separate independence of will, and only by the concordance of these two at least theoretically conflicting wills, produce the harmonious action of the two natures? At what point did the duality terminate—the unity begin?

Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, first, it might seem almost inadvertently, stirred this perplexing question. He discovered a writing of his holy predecessor, Mennas, which distinctly asserted that the Christ was actuated by but one will. He communicated it to some of the Eastern bishops, to Theodorus of Pharan, who had a high name as a theologian, and to Cyrus, then Bishop of Phasis; both bowed before the authority, and accepted the doctrine of Mennas.

The Emperor Heraclius, though he did not aspire to

the character of a distinguished theologian, like his predecessor Justinian, could not, even occupied as he was with his adventurous and successful campaigns in the East, keep himself aloof from religious controversy.<sup>1</sup> In a suspension

of arms during his war of invasion against the Lazians he encountered at Phasis the Bishop

Cyrus, whom he consulted on the important question of the single or double will, the single or double operation

in Christ. Cyrus appealed to the Patriarch of

Constantinople, who on his own authority, and that of his predecessor, Mennas, decided in favour of the Monothelitic view. This doctrine had already offered itself under the captivating aspect of an intermediate term, which might conciliate the Monophysites with the Church. In Armenia, four years before, Heraclius had an interview with Paul, a follower of Severus, who, taken with the notion of one operation in Christ, was disposed to accede (with this explanation) to the Council of Chalcedon. At a later period, a more important personage, the Jacobite

Patriarch, Anastasius, consented to remain, on these terms,

with the Catholic Church. He was to be rewarded with the patriarchate of Antioch. Anas-

tasius, it is said by his enemies, a man of consummate craft, had overreached the unsuspecting emperor; the Jacobites mocked the simplicity of the Catholics, who, by this concession, instead of winning converts, had gone over to the doctrines of their adversaries. Monothelism was but another form of Monophysitism.

Sergius of Constantinople addressed a letter to Honorius I. Honorius, in distinct words, declared himself a Monothelite. Yet Honorius, it is manifest, entirely misapprehended the question, and seemed not in the least to understand its subtle bearings on the controversies of the East. The unity which he asserted was not an identity, but a harmony. His main argument was, that the sinless human nature of Christ, being ignorant of that other law in the members, warring against the law of the mind, there could be no conflicting or adverse will in the

<sup>1</sup> Walch has assigned the dates, dents in the history of the Monothelitic controversy.—Ketzer-Geschichte, t. ix. adopted in the text, for the various inci-

God-Man.\* But this plainer and more practical conception of the question betrayed the unsuspecting Pope into words, to which the Monothelites, proud of their important partisan, as well as the stern polemic resentment of his adversaries, bound him down A.D. 633, 634. with inexorable rigour. Notwithstanding the charitable attempt of one of his successors, John IV., to interpret his words in this wider meaning, Honorius I. was branded by the Council of Constantinople with the name of heretic.

The whole church might seem in danger of falling into the same condemnation. All the prelates of the great sees of Rome, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, now occupied by Cyrus, formerly Bishop of Phasis, and of Antioch, had asserted the one indivisible will in Christ. In Egypt this reconciling tenet had wrought wonders. On this basis had been framed certain chapters, which the followers of Dioscorus and of Severus, all the Jacobite sects, received with eager promptitude. For once the whole people of Alexandria became one flock; almost all Egypt, Libya, and the adjacent provinces, with one voice and one spirit, obeyed the orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria.<sup>m</sup> Sophronius alone, who during the controversy became Bishop of Jerusalem, the same Sophronius who afterwards signed the humiliating capitulation of Jerusalem to the Mohammedans, boldly asserted and elaborately defended the doctrine of the two wills. So deeply impressed was Sophronius with the vital importance of this question, that long after, when the Saracens were masters of the Holy City, he took Stephen, Bishop of Dora, to the spot which was supposed to be the Golgotha, the place of the Lord's crucifixion. "To that God," he said, "who on this very place was crucified for thee, at his second coming to judge the quick and the dead, thou shalt render thine account, if thou delayest or art remiss in the

\* *ὅτι καὶ ἡ θλίψις ἡμελογοῦμεν τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐπειδὴ προδήλως ὑπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας προεβλήθη ἡ ἡμετέρα φύσις, οὐκ ἁμαρτία ἐν ἐκείνῃ, ὅτι καὶ ἡ φύσις, πρὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας πτωχίσθη, οὐκ ἔστι μετὰ τὴν σαρὰν βασιν ἰσθῆναι.*—Honor. Epist., Labbe, 930.

The metaphysical and practical character of the two letters contrast singularly. Honorius reproves the introduction of terms not recognised by the Scriptures.

<sup>m</sup> Sergii ad Honor. Epist. apud Concil. Const. III., Labbe, p. 921.

defence of his imperilled faith; go thou forth in my place. As thou knowest, on account of this Saracen invasion, now fallen upon us for our sins, I cannot bodily strive for the truth, and before the world proclaim, to the end of the earth, to the apostolic throne at Rome, the tenets of orthodoxy." Sophronius protested, appealed, wrote large volumes; and the religious peace which seemed descending on the afflicted East, gave place again to strife, and feud, and mutual anathema.

But in the Byzantine empire, the creed to its nicest shades and variations was an affair of state: it was fixed, or at least defined, by imperial authority. Heraclius, while he looked with miscalculating or awe-struck apathy on the progress of the Mohammedan arms, could not refrain from interference with this question of metaphysic theology. In his name appeared the famous *Ecthesis*,<sup>n</sup> or Exposition of the Faith, drawn in all probability by the Patriarch Sergius, but which, as professed by the emperor, his subjects were bound to receive in humble and unquestioning obedience. The *Ecthesis* declared the two wills in Christ to be a heresy, which even the impious Nestorius had not dared to promulgate. It was affixed, as the proclamation of the imperial creed, on the gates of the great church at Constantinople. The publication of the *Ecthesis* was followed, or immediately preceded, by the death of Sergius of Constantinople and that of Honorius of Rome.

A.D. 638.  
Oct. 12.

The Popes who succeeded Honorius amply retrieved by their resolute opposition to Monothelitism what was considered the delinquency of that prelate. On the death of Honorius, Severinus was elected to the papal throne; but the confirmation of his election was long delayed at Constantinople, and only conceded on the promise of his envoys that he would accede to the creed of Heraclius. Severinus, however, repudiated the Monothelitic doctrine. In the interval between the election and confirmation of Severinus, the plunder of the treasures of the Roman Church by the Exarch of Ravenna showed the unscrupulous and irreverent character

Severinus  
Pope A.D.  
638 (?), not  
confirmed till  
640.

<sup>n</sup> *Ecthesis Heraclii apud Labbe*, p. 200.

of the Byzantine government. Maurice, the Chartulary, harangued the soldiers. While they were defrauded of their pay the Church was revelling in wealth. The Exarch's officer occupied the Lateran palace, sealed up all the accumulated riches which Christian emperors, patricians, consuls had bestowed for their souls' health, for the use of the poor, and the redemption of captives. The rapacious Exarch Isaac hastened to Rome; the plunder was divided, the Emperor propitiated by his share, which was transmitted to Constantinople; the more refractory of the clergy, who presumed to remonstrate, were sent into banishment.

Severinus died after a pontificate of two months and four days. He was succeeded by John IV., a Dalmatian by birth.<sup>o</sup> John not only condemned the Monothelite doctrine, but piously endeavoured to vindicate the memory of his predecessor Honorius from the imputation of heresy. Honorius had denied only the two human wills, the conflicting sinful will of fallen man, and the impeccable will, in the person of Christ.<sup>p</sup> But the apology of John neither absolved the memory of Honorius before the Council of Constantinople, nor did the religious reverence of his successors, whose envoys were present at that Council, interpose in his behalf. The apology of John was addressed to the Emperor Constantine, whom it did not reach. For the death of Heraclius was followed by a rapid succession of revolutions at Constantinople. The later years of that Emperor had contrasted unfavourably with the glorious activity of his earlier administration. The conqueror of Persia seemed to look on the progress of Mohammedanism with the apathy of despair. He had deeply wounded the religious feelings of his subjects by an incestuous marriage with his niece Martina. It was the object of his dying wishes, of his last testament, that his son by Martina, Heracleonas, should share the empire with his elder brother, Con-

A.D. 640.  
Aug. 2.  
John IV.  
consecrated  
Dec. 25.

Death of  
Heraclius.  
Revolution  
in Constanti-  
nople.

<sup>o</sup> Anastasius in vitâ.

<sup>p</sup> "Decessor meus, docens de mysteriis incarnationis Christi, dicebat non fuisse in eo, sicut in nobis peccatoribus, mentis et carnis contrarias voluntates;

quod quidam ad proprium sensum convertentes, divinitatis ejus et humanitatis unam eum voluntatem docuisse suspicati sunt."—Epist. Joan., Labbe or Mansi, sub ann. 641.

stantine. The two sons of Heraclius were proclaimed coequal Cæsars, under the sovereignty of the Empress Martina. But even Constantinople would not submit to the sway of an incestuous female. Martina was compelled to descend from the throne, and was succeeded by the feeble Constantine, whose decaying health broke down after a reign of but a hundred days. The enemies of Martina ascribed his death to poison administered by his stepmother and by Pyrrhus the Patriarch. Martina indeed again assumed the empire; but Constantine on his death-bed had taken measures to secure the protection of the army for his children, the legitimate descendants of Heraclius. He had been assured that Heraclius had placed vast sums of money in the hands of the Patriarch to maintain the interests of Martina and her son. He, therefore, before he expired, sent a large donative to Valentinus, who commanded the army in the suburb of Chalcedon. Valentinus imperiously demanded the punishment of the guilty usurpers, of the assassins of Constantine. The citizens of Constantinople mingled with the ferocious soldiery. In the church of St. Sophia, Heracleonas was compelled to mount the pulpit holding by the hand Constans, the elder of the sons of Constantine. With one voice the people, the soldiers, saluted Constans sole Emperor. A wild scene of pillage ensued; the barbarian soldiers, the Jews, and other lawless partisans desecrated the holy edifice by every kind of outrage. The Patriarch Pyrrhus, after depositing a protest on the high altar, fled. The Senate condemned Martina to the loss of her tongue, Heracleonas to the mutilation of his nose; these wretched victims were sent to die in exile. Constans was sole Emperor, and would brook no rival. His own brother Theodosius was compelled to incapacitate himself for sovereignty by holy orders. Yet even so the jealousy of Constans felt no security. Nothing was indelible to the imperial will at Constantinople; a successful usurper would have shaken off even that disqualification. Nearly twenty years after, Theodosius, the deacon, was assassinated by the command of his brother, whom the indignant people drove from his throne.

In the mean time religious war continued without abatement between Rome and Constantinople. The Monothelite Paul succeeded the Monothelite Pyrrhus. The Ecthesis kept its place on the doors of the great church. But in the West, and in the whole of the African churches yet unsubdued by the Mohammedans, all Latin Christianity adhered to the doctrine of the two Wills. The monk Maximus, the indefatigable adversary of Monothelitism, travelled through the East, and through Africa, denouncing the heresy of Sergius, and exciting to the rejection of the imperial Ecthesis. In Africa he held <sup>A.D. 645.</sup> a long disputation, still extant, with the exile Pyrrhus. Theodorus I. had succeeded after the short pope- <sup>Pope Theo-  
dorus. A.D.  
642, Nov. 24.</sup> dom of John IV. to the pontifical throne of Rome. Theodorus rejected Monothelitism with the utmost zeal. During his pontificate, Pyrrhus of Constantinople came to Rome. Whether or not he acknowledged himself confuted by the unanswerable metaphysics of Maximus, he presented a memorial recanting all his errors on the single Will in Christ.<sup>a</sup> The Pope Theodorus had received with courtesy from Paul, the successor of Pyrrhus, the communication of his advancement to the see of Constantinople; he had expressed some cautious doubts as to the regularity of the deposition of Pyrrhus, yet he had given his full approbation, he had expressed his joy on the elevation of Paul.<sup>b</sup> But Paul was a Monothelite, Pyrrhus at his feet a penitent convert to orthodoxy. <sup>A.D. 646.</sup> Pyrrhus was received with all the honours which belonged to the actual patriarch of Constantinople.

But Pyrrhus, from what motive appears not, retired to Ravenna, recanted his recantation, and declared himself a conscientious Monothelite.<sup>c</sup> The indignant pontiff was not content with the ordinary terrors of excommunication against this double renegade. In a full <sup>A.D. 648.</sup> assembly of the clergy of Rome, and of the neighbouring

<sup>a</sup> "Præsentē cuncto clero et populo, condemnavit omnia, quæ a se vel a decessoribus suis scripta vel acta sunt adversus immaculatam fidem."—Vit. Theodor.

<sup>b</sup> "Et quidem gavisus super hujus sumus ordinatione."—Epist. Theodori

ad Episcop. Constantin, apud Labbe, sub ann.

<sup>c</sup> He may have hoped for his reinstatement in the patriarchate by the recommendation of the Exarch, and have found that his reconciliation with Rome stood in his way.

bishops, he heaped the most vehement anathemas on the head of the new Judas, and calling for the consecrated wine on the altar, poured some drops into the ink, and so signed the excommunication with the blood of Christ. Is it to be supposed that the blood of the Redeemer was revered in a less appalling sense than in later ages, or that the passion of the Pope triumphed not only over Christian moderation, but over the strongest religious awe? Theodorus was not satisfied with the excommunication of Pyrrhus, he excommunicated Paul also. Paul revenged himself by suppressing the religious worship of the papal envoys at the Court, maltreating, and even causing to be scourged some of their attendants.

Martin I., the successor of Theodorus, plunged more deeply, and with more fatal consequences, into this religious strife, or rather this revolt of the Western Province against the religious supremacy of the Emperor. Constans had withdrawn the obnoxious *Ecthesis*; Paul the Patriarch had himself ordered it to be removed from the gates of the great Church. The *Ecthesis* of Heraclius was replaced by the *Type* of Constans. The *Type* spoke altogether a different language; it aspired to silence by authority this interminable dispute. It presumed not to define the Creed, further than all parties were agreed, or beyond the decisions of the former councils. It stated the question with perspicuity and fairness, and positively prohibited the use of the phrase either of the single or the double Will and Energy.<sup>a</sup> The penalties for the infringement of the Imperial decree were severe: against the ecclesiastic, deposition and deprivation; against the monk, seclusion and banishment from his monastery; against the public officer, civil or military, degradation; against the private man of rank, confiscation of goods; against the common people, scourging and banishment.

Martin summoned a council in the Lateran, which was attended by 105 bishops, chiefly from Italy and the adjacent islands. After five sessions, in which

Martin I.  
June, 649.

A.D. 649.  
Oct. 5.

<sup>a</sup> Theophanes, p. 509, ed. Bonn.; "The Type in Labbe or Mansi, sub Anastas., p. 163, *ibid.*; Vit. Maximi; ann. Epist. Synodal.

the whole West repudiated Monothelitism with perfect unanimity, twenty canons were framed condemning that heresy with all its authors. But Pope Martin was not content with anathematising the erroneous doctrine of the Single Will, with humbling the rival prelate of Constantinople by excommunication in full council, with declaring the edict of the deceased Emperor Heraclius, the *Ecthesis*, absolutely impious; he denounced as of equal impiety the Type of the reigning Emperor. Its exhortation to peace he scorned as a persuasive to unholy acquiescence in heresy; silence on such doctrines was a wicked suppression of divine truth.

Nor was Martin wanting in activity to maintain his bold position. He published the decrees of the Lateran Council throughout the West; he addressed letters to the Frankish kings, entreating them to send representatives of their churches to join a solemn spiritual embassy to Constantinople. He despatched other missives to Britain, to Spain, and to Africa. He even appointed a Legate in the East to supersede the Monothelite patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. His letter to Paul of Thessalonica is in a tone of condemnatory haughtiness which had hardly yet been assumed by a successor of St. Peter.<sup>7</sup>

But to the Emperor of the East the Pope was a refractory subject and no more. In Constantinople the person of the bishop had never been invested in that sanctity which shielded it from law, or that which was law in the East, the imperial will. Even the natural reverence for the holy office had been disturbed by the perpetual feuds, the mutual anathemas and excommunications, the depositions, the degradations, the expulsions, fatal to that unhappy see: and as old Rome was now a provincial city,

<sup>7</sup> See a curious specimen of the logic of anathema. The Bishop of Thessalonica, because he refuses to join Martin in anathematising the Monothelites, is confirming all the errors of Pagans, Jews, and heretics:—"Ut per hoc non solum eos etiam quos anathematisamus, nempe ipsas hæreticorum personas, anathematisare recuses . . . sed ut etiam omnem omnium errorem Paganorum,

Judeorum, hæreticorum in te confirmes. Si enim omnia omnium horum dogmata condemnamus, ut contraria et inimica veritati, tu vero omnia una nobiscum voce non anathematisas quæ anathematisamus, consequens est, te horum omnium errorem confirmasse, qui a nobis sive ab ecclesiâ catholicâ anathematisatur."—Ad Paul. Episc. Thessal. apud Labbe, sub ann. 649.

her bishop would not command greater respect than the prelate of the Imperial Capital.

The Exarch Olympius received orders to seize the Pope, if he persisted in his contumacy to the imperial edict, and to send him prisoner to Constantinople. But Olympius found the people of Rome prepared to take up arms in defence of their bishop. He attempted to obtain his end by more peaceful means. Later writers have protected the Pope by miracle from an attempted assassination,\* and bowed the awestruck Exarch before the feet of Martin. But Olympius was hastily summoned from Rome to repel an invasion of Sicily by the Saracens, and died of fatigue in that island.

The new Exarch Theodorus, named Calliopas, was more resolute in the execution of his orders. He marched to Rome, and summoned the Pope to surrender to the Imperial authority. Some delay took place from the apprehensions of the Exarch, that soldiers, and means of defence, stones, and other weapons, were concealed in the Church. But Martin shrunk from bloodshed, and refused the offers of his partisans, headed by many of the clergy, to resist

the Exarch. Martin had ordered his bed to be strewed before the high altar in the Lateran. The Exarch and his troops entered the Church, the light of the candles flickered on the armour of the soldiery. Martin obeyed the summons of the Exarch to accompany him to the Lateran palace; there he was permitted to see some of

the clergy. But suddenly he was hurried into a litter, the gates of Rome closed to prevent his partisans from following him, he was carried to the harbour of Pontus, embarked and landed at Messina. Thence

to Avidos, on the island of Naxos, where he was first permitted the use of a bath. The pious clergy crowded with their votive presents, the presents were seized, and the donors beaten back by the soldiery: "he who is a friend to Pope Martin is an enemy to the State." From Avidos a messenger was sent to Constantinople, to an-

\* The swordsman of Olympius was employed to stab the Pope while administering the communion to the Exarch; he was struck with blindness.—Anastas. in Vit.

nounce the arrival of the heretic and the rebel, the enemy and disturber of the whole Roman empire. On the 17th of September he arrived at Constantinople; he was left lying on a bed on the deck of the ship the whole day, the gaze of curious or hostile spectators. At sunset he was carried on a litter under a strong guard to Prandearia, Pope Martin in Constantinople. the chief guard-house. There he was imprisoned, and forbidden to make known who he was. After ninety-three days of this imprisonment he was conveyed, on account of his weakness, on a litter before the Senate. He was commanded to stand, but being unable, was supported by two guards. "Wretch," said the chief minister, "what wrong has the Emperor done to thee? has he deprived thee of anything, or used any violence against thee?" Martin was silent. Twenty witnesses were examined in order to connect him with some treason against the Emperor.\* Troilus demanded why he had not prevented, but rather consented to the rebellion of the exarch Olympius. "How could I oppose the rebellion of Olympius, who had the whole army of Italy at his command? Did I appoint him Exarch?" The Pope was carried out to be exposed in a public place, where the Emperor could see him from a window. He was then half-stripped of his clothes, which were rent down, amid the anathemas of the people. The executioner fixed an iron collar round his neck, and led him through the city to the Prætorium, with a sword carried before him. He was then cast first into a dungeon, where murderers were confined, then into another chamber, where he lay half-naked and shivering with cold. The order for his execution was expected every moment. The next day the Patriarch Paul was lying on his death-bed, and besought the Emperor to show mercy to the persecuted Martin.<sup>b</sup> A.D. 654. Martin, who hoped for speedy martyrdom, heard this with regret. On the death of Paul, Pyrrhus, who had returned

\* He denied that he had sent money to the Saracens; he had only given some moderate sums to certain destitute servants of God. He repudiated the charge of having disdained the worship of the Virgin.—Ad Theodor.

Epist.; Sirmond. iii. 320; Mansi sub ann.

<sup>b</sup> All this curious detail is furnished by two letters of Martin himself, and a long account by one of his followers.—Apud Labbe, pp. 63-75.

from Italy, resumed the throne of Constantinople. A long examination of Martin took place on the conduct of Pyrrhus at Rome. For eighty-five days Martin languished in prison: he was at length taken away, and embarked for the inhospitable shores of Cherson. At Cherson

A.D. 655.

he died. Such was the end of a Pope of the seventh century, who dared to resist the will of the Emperor. The monk Maximus and some of his followers were treated even with greater cruelty. Maximus refused to deny the two Wills in Christ; his tongue and his right hand were cut off, and so mutilated he was sent into exile.<sup>c</sup>

A.D. 657.

While Martin was yet living, Eugenius was elected to the see of Rome. His short rule<sup>d</sup> was followed by the longer but uneventful Pontificate of Vitalianus. The popes, warned by the fate of Martin, if they did not receive, did not condemn the Type of Constans. They allowed the question of the two

A.D. 657.  
July 30.

Wills in Christ to slumber. Eugenius received from the new Patriarch of Constantinople, Peter, the account of his elevation, with a declaration of faith, silent on the disputed point. During the pontificate of Vitalianus Rome was visited by the Byzantine emperor. Constans had withdrawn from the Eastern Rome for ever. He dared not confront the hatred of the people on account of the murder of his brother the Deacon Theodosius, whom not even the tonsure could protect from his jealousy.<sup>e</sup> He was pursued by the curses of mankind; and by the avenging spectre of his brother, which constantly offered to his lips a cup of blood: "Drink, brother, drink!" Yet in his restless wanderings he at times proclaimed a nobler object, the repression of the Saracens, who now began to command the Mediterranean and threaten Sicily, and of

<sup>c</sup> Collatio S. Maxim. cum Theodoro, apud Labbe; Theophan. Cedrenus, Vit. Maximi.—Libellus Synod.

<sup>d</sup> If reckoned from the banishment of Martin, 2 years, 8 months, and 24 days (654–657). If from the death of Martin, only 6 months and 23 days. But the chronology is doubtful.—Binii. Not. in Anastas. Vit. apud Labbe, 432.

<sup>e</sup> According to Cedrenus, at the tonsure of Theodosius, he had received the sacrament, it should seem, as a pledge for his brother's future security. *Ἰερεὺς ἀγρίων ἐν τῷ διὰ Παύλου παρελθόντων δαίμονων, ὃς καὶ μισθῶκε τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸν ἀχραντὸν μυστήριον ἐν ἀγίῳ ποτηρίῳ.*—P. 343.

the Lombards, who seemed about to swallow up the Byzantine Exarchate in Italy.<sup>f</sup> It is even said that in his hatred to Constantinople, he proposed to restore the empire to old Rome.<sup>g</sup> But he visited Rome as a plunderer, not as the restorer of her power. He <sup>A.D. 663.</sup> July 5. was received by the Pope Vitalianus almost with religious honours. The haughty conduct of Constans in Rome, and the timid servility of Vitalianus, contrast with those meetings of the Western Cæsars, fifty years later, with the successors of St. Peter. To the Emperor, the Pope is merely the high priest of the city. To the Pope, the Emperor is his undoubted lord and master. The Emperor has all the unquestioning arrogance of the sovereign, whose word is law, and who commands without scruple the plunder of the public edifices, sacred as well as profane; the Pope the subject, who dares not interpose to protect the property of the city, or even of the Church. Constans <sup>July 17.</sup> remained twelve days in Rome; all the ornaments of brass, besides more precious metals, were stripped from the churches, the iron roof torn from the Pantheon, now a church, and the whole sent off to Constantinople. Constans retired amid the suppressed executions of all orders, to die a miserable death at Syracuse. <sup>A.D. 668.</sup>

The Byzantine government did not discourage encroachments even on the spiritual supremacy of Rome in the West. Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna, emboldened by his city having become the capital of the Exarchate, asserted and maintained his independence of the Bishop of Rome. The Archbishop of Ravenna boasted of a privilege, issued by the Emperors Heraclius and Constantine, which exempted him from all superior episcopal authority, from the authority of the Patriarch of old Rome.<sup>h</sup> Vitalianus hurled his excommunication against Maurus. Maurus threw back his excommunication against Vitalianus. It was not till the pontificate of Leo II. that the

<sup>f</sup> Paulus Diacon. lib. v.

<sup>g</sup> βουλόμηναι καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν περιουσίαν Ῥώμης μετατρέψαι.—Zonar. l. xiv. 11; Glycas. Theophanes.

<sup>h</sup> "Sancimus amplius securam atque liberam ab omni superiori Episcopali

conditione manere, et solum orationi vacare pro nostro imperio, et non subjacere pro quolibet modo patriarchæ antiquæ urbis Romæ, sed manere eam æιτονιφάλην."—Agnelli, Vit. Pontif. Ravenn. apud Muratori, p. 148.

pride of the Archbishop of Ravenna was humbled or self-humiliated; and Maurus, who had been an object of superstitious veneration to the people, deposed from his sanctity. Archbishop Theodorus, involved in a violent contest with his clergy, sacrificed the independent dignity of his see to his own power, and submitted to Rome; he was rewarded with the title of saint.<sup>1</sup>

Adeodatus and Domnus, or Donus, the successors of Vitalianus, have left hardly any record of their actions to Christian history. But the summons to a general council at Constantinople was issued by the successor of Constans, Constantine the Bearded, during the pontificate of Domnus; it arrived after the accession of Agatho, a Sicilian, to the Roman pontificate.

Constantine the Bearded was seized apparently with a sudden and an unexplained desire to reunite the East and the West under one creed. Monothelism may have been more unpopular in the East, than outward circumstances had shown; the monks may have been of the opposite party; Constantine himself may have felt religious doubts as to the prevailing creed. It was not, however, till fourteen years after his accession that the sixth general council actually assembled at Constantinople to decide the question of Monothelism. They met in a chamber of the imperial palace. The Emperor himself presided, by twelve of his chief ministers. Of the great patriarchs were present George of Constantinople, and Macarius of Antioch. The designated envoys of Pope Agatho were the Bishops Abundantius of Paterneum, John of Portus, John of Rhegium, the sub-deacon Constantine, the presbyters Theodorus and Gregory, and the deacon John. Pope Agatho had entertained a hope of the presence of Theodorus, Archbishop of Canterbury, "the philosopher." He makes something of an ostentatious boast of the Lombard, Slavian, Frank, Gaulish, Gothic, and British bishops, subject to his authority.<sup>2</sup> Two

<sup>1</sup> Agnelli, p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> "Sperabamus deinde de Britannia Theodorum archiepiscopum et philosophum ad nostram humilitatem conjungere; et maxime quia in medio gentium,

tam Longobardorum, quamque Slavorum, necnon Francorum, Gallorum, Gothorum, atque Britannorum, pluri mihi confamulorum nostrorum esse noscuntur."—Apud Mansi, sub ann. 680.

monks, George and Peter, represented the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and of Alexandria. The proceedings were conducted with solemn regularity. On one side were the legates of Pope Agatho, on the other Macarius of Antioch, a determined Monothelite. During the seventh sitting George, the Patriarch of Constantinople, rose and declared that, having carefully compared the passages from the fathers, cited by the Westerns and by Macarius, he had been convinced by the unanswerable arguments of the Romans ; "to them I offer my adhesion, theirs is my confession and belief." The example of George was followed by the Bishops of Ephesus, Heraclea, Cyzicum, Chalcedon, the Phrygian Hierapolis, Byzia in Thrace, Mytilene, Methymna, Selybria, Prusias, and Anastasiopolis. Macarius and his scholar, the monk Stephen, stood alone in open and contumacious resistance to the doctrine of the two wills. Macarius was degraded from his Patriarchal dignity ; the monk Stephen condemned as another Eutyches or Apollinaris. The fifteenth session was enlivened by a strange episode. A monk, Polychronius, denounced as an obstinate Monothelite, challenged the council to put the doctrine to the test of a miracle. He would lay his creed on a dead body ; if the dead rose not, he surrendered himself to the will of the Emperor. A body was brought into a neighbouring bath. The Emperor, the ministers, the whole council, and a wondering multitude, adjourned to this place. Polychronius presented a sealed paper, which was opened and read ; it declared his creed, and that he had been commanded in a vision to hasten to Constantinople to prevent the Emperor from establishing heresy. The paper was laid on the corpse, Polychronius sat whispering into its ear, and the patient assembly awaited the issue for some hours. But the obstinate dead would not come to life. An unanimous anathema (all seem to have been too serious for ridicule) condemned Polychronius as an heretic and a deceiver. The Synod returned to its chamber, and endeavoured to argue with the contumacious Polychronius, who, still inflexible, was degraded from all his functions.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> Concil. sub ann.

The council proceeded with its anathemas. George of Constantinople endeavoured to save his predecessors from being denounced by name; the council rejected his motion, and one cry broke forth—Anathema against the heretic Theodorus of Pharan! Anathema against the heretic Sergius! (of Constantinople). Anathema against the heretic Cyrus! Anathema against the heretic Honorius! (of Rome). Anathema against the heretic Pyrrhus; against the heretic Paul; against Peter, Macarius, Polychronius, and a certain Apergius! At the close of the proceedings of this sixth general council, a creed was framed, distinctly asserting the two wills and the two operations in Christ; and at the close of all, amid gratulations to the Cæsar, were again recited the names of the anathematised heretics, commencing with Nestorius, ending with Sergius, Honorius of Rome, and all the more distinguished Monothelites.

The decree of the Council of Constantinople, the sixth œcumenic council, was at once a triumph and an humiliation to the see of Rome; a triumph as establishing the orthodoxy of the doctrines maintained in the West by all the Bishops of Rome, excepting Honorius. The Patriarch of Constantinople had been constrained to recant the creed of his predecessors; the whole line after Sergius had been involved in one anathema. The Emperor himself had adopted the creed of Rome; the one obstinate Patriarch, Macarius of Antioch, had been stripped of his pall, and driven, with every mark of personal insult and ignominy, from the assembly. Yet was it an humiliation, for it condemned a Bishop of Rome as an anathematised heretic. But, while the Pope made the most of his triumph, he seemed utterly to disregard the humiliation. The impeccability of the Bishop of Rome was not as yet an article of the Roman creed. The successor of Agatho (who had died during the sitting of the Council), Pope Leo II., announced to the churches of the West the universal acceptance of the Roman doctrine; to the bishops and to the King of Spain he recapitulated the names of the anathematised heretics, among the rest of Honorius, who, instead of quenching the flame of heresy, as became

the apostolic authority, had fanned it by his negligence; who had permitted the immaculate rule of faith, handed down by his predecessors, to suffer defilement.<sup>a</sup> The condemned Monothelites of the East were banished to Rome, as the place in which they were most likely to be converted from their errors; and where some of them, weary of imprisonment in the monasteries to which they were consigned, abjured their former creed. Macarius of Antioch alone resisted alike all theological arguments, and all the more worldly temptations of reinstatement in the dignity and honours of his see.

The names of the Popes Benedict II., of John V., a Syrian by birth, of Conon, and of Sergius, fill up the rest of the seventh century. During this period an attempt was made to remedy the inconvenience of awaiting so long the imperial confirmation of the papal election. Nearly a year elapsed before the consecration of Benedict II. An edict of Constantine, who still cultivated a close alliance with the Popes, enacted that, on the unanimous suffrage of the clergy, the people, and the soldiery (the soldiery are now assuming in the election of the Pontiff the privilege of the Prætorian Guard in the election of the Emperor), the Pope might at once proceed to his consecration. This regulation, however, demanded that rare occurrence on the election of a Bishop of Rome, unanimity. On the election of Conon, and afterwards of Sergius, strife arose, and contending competitors divided the suffrages. The Exarch of Ravenna resumed his right of interference and of final sanction before the consecration of the Pope. On the death of Conon three candidates were proposed by their conflicting partisans. The Archdeacon Paschalis, the Archpresbyter Theodorus, were supported by two rival factions, a third proposed Sergius, of a Syrian family, which had settled at Palermo in Sicily. Each of the other candidates occupied a strong

A.D. 682,  
Sept., Oct.

Popes.  
Benedict II.,  
A.D. 683-686.  
John V.,  
A.D. 686, 686.  
Conon,  
A.D. 686, 687.  
Sergius I.,  
A.D. 687.

A.D. 684.  
Jan. 26.

Theodorus,  
A.D. 687.  
Paschalis  
anti-Pope,  
A.D. 687-692.

<sup>a</sup> "Qui flammam heretici dogmatis, non ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit."—Ad Episcop. Hispan., Labbe, p. 1246. "Honorius Romanus qui im-

maculatam apostolicæ traditionis regulam quam a prædecessoribus suis accepit maculari consensit."—Epist. ad Ervig. Reg. Hispan., p. 1252.

position in the city, when the third party set up Sergius, and carried him in triumph to the Lateran Palace. Theodorus was compelled to surrender his claims, but Paschalis had sent large offers of money to Ravenna, and depended on the support of the Exarch. The Exarch came to Rome, declared in favour of Sergius, but exacted from him a donative at least equal to that offered by the rejected Paschalis.<sup>o</sup> The churches were laid under contribution to satisfy the rapacious Exarch.

Sergius rejected certain canons of the Quinisextan Council,<sup>p</sup> which assembled at the summons of the Emperor Justinian II. This Council is the great authority for the discipline of the Greek Church. Rigid in its enactments against marriage after entering into holy orders, and severe against those who had married two wives, or wives under any taint as of widowhood, actresses, or any unlawful occupation, it nevertheless deliberately repudiated the Roman canon<sup>q</sup> which forced such priests to give up all commerce with their wives: it asserted the permission of Scripture in favour of a married clergy, married, that is, to virgins and reputable wives previous to taking orders. Sergius disdainfully refused his adhesion to the authority of the Council, and annulled its decrees. Justinian, like his predecessor Constans, endeavoured to treat the Pope as a refractory subject. He sent orders for his apprehension and transportation to Constantinople. But Sergius was strong, not only in the affections of the people, but of the army also. The protospatharius, the officer of the Emperor, was driven with insult from the city; the Pope was obliged to interfere in order to appease the tumult among the indignant soldiery. Ere the Emperor could revenge his insulted dignity he was himself deposed. Before his restoration Sergius had been dead several years. Even if the successors of Sergius pursued his contumacious policy, nearer objects of detestation first demanded the revenge of Justinian, who had no time to waste on a distant priest who

Sergius died.  
A.D. 701.  
Justinian  
restored, 705.

<sup>o</sup> Anastas. in Vit. Sergii.

<sup>q</sup> Can. iii. xiii. apud Labbe, pp.

<sup>p</sup> Called also the Council in Trullo, 1141-1148.  
from the chamber in the imperial palace  
in which it was held.

had only resisted his religious supremacy. But on a later occasion Justinian asserted to the utmost the imperial authority.

The eighth century opened with the pontificate of John VI., in which the papal influence displayed John VI.  
A.D. 702-705. itself in the becoming character of protector of the peace of the city. He saved the life of the Exarch Theophylact, against whom the soldiery had risen in insurrection: they were calmed by the persuasive eloquence of the Pontiff. Certain infamous persons had made charges against some of the more eminent citizens of Rome, to tempt the Exarch to plunder them of their property. By the Pope's influence they were themselves punished by a heavy fine. He compelled or persuaded the Lombard Duke of Benevento, who had made a predatory incursion into Campania, to withdraw into his own territories. The Pope redeemed all the captives which the Lombard had taken.

During the pontificate of John VII., a Greek, the Emperor Justinian II. resumed the throne of Constantinople. The timid Pope trembled at his John VII.  
705-707. commands to receive the decrees of the Quinisextan Council; he endeavoured to temporise, but escaped by death from the conflict. Sisinnius, a Syrian, A.D. 707. was chosen his successor, but died twenty days after his election.

He was succeeded by Constantine, another Syrian. At the commencement of his pontificate, Felix, the newly-elected Archbishop of Ravenna, came to Constantine. Rome for his consecration. But Felix refused to sign the customary writing testifying his allegiance to the Roman see, and to renounce the independence of Ravenna. The imperial ministers at Rome took part against him, and, in fear of their power, he tendered an ambiguous act of submission, in which he declared his repugnance to his own deed. It was said that this act, laid up in the Roman archives, was in a few days found black and shrivelled as by fire. But Felix had a more dangerous enemy than Pope Constantine. The Emperor Justinian had now glutted his vengeance on his enemies in the East; he

sought to punish those who had either assisted or at least rejoiced in his fall in the more distant provinces. The inhabitants of Ravenna had incurred his wrath; a fleet, with Theodorus the patrician at its head, appeared in their

haven; the city was occupied, the chief citizens seized, according to one account by treachery,

transported to Constantinople, and there by the sentence of the Emperor put to death. The Archbishop was deprived of his eyes in the most cruel manner by

the express orders of the Emperor. He was then banished to the Crimea.\* The terrible Justinian still aimed at reducing the West to obedience to the Quinisextan Council. He summoned Constantine before his presence in Constantinople. The Pope had the courage and wisdom to obey. His obedience conciliated the Emperor.

Everywhere he was entertained and he was permitted to delay till the tempestuous winter season

was passed. In the spring he arrived in Constantinople, where he was received by Tiberius, son of the Emperor. Justinian was himself at Nicea; he advanced to Nicomedia to meet the Bishop of Rome. It is said by the Western writers that the Emperor knelt and kissed the feet of the Pope—an act neither consonant to Greek usage nor to the character of Justinian. But the Emperor's pride was gratified by the submission of Constantine. How far the Pope consented to the canons of the Quinisextan Council, by what arts he eluded those which were adverse to the Roman discipline, history is silent. But Constantine returned to Italy in high favour with the Emperor, and bearing the imperial confirmation of all the privileges of the Church of Rome. The wisdom of Constantine's conduct became still more manifest. During his absence, John Rizocopus, the new Exarch, entered Rome, seized and put to death many of the principal clergy. The Exarch proceeded to Ravenna, where he was slain in an insurrection of the citizens.† This insurrection grew to an open revolt. Ravenna and the Pentapolis threw off the imperial yoke, under the com-

\* Anastas. in Vit.; Agnelli, Vitæ Pontif. Ravennat.

† Anastasius—Agnelli, ut supra.

mand of George, son of Giovannicius, the Emperor's secretary. On the death of Justinian and the change of the dynasty they renewed their allegiance; the blind Archbishop Felix returned from his banishment, and resumed the functions of his see.

Constantine was the last Pope who was the humble subject of the Eastern Emperor. With Gregory II. we enter on a new epoch in the history of Latin Christendom. A.D. 716.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

## ICONOCLASM.

THE eighth century gave birth to a religious contest, in its origin, in its nature, and in its important political consequences entirely different from all those which had hitherto distracted Christendom. Iconoclasm. Iconoclasm was an attempt of the Eastern Emperor to change by his own arbitrary command the religion of his subjects. No religious revolution has ever been successful which has commenced with the government. Such revolutions have ever begun in the middle or lower orders of society, struck on some responsive chord of sympathy in the general feeling, supplied some religious want, stirred some religious energy, and shaken the inert strength of the established faith by some stronger counter emotion. Whatever the motives of the Emperor Leo the Isaurian (and on this subject, as in all the religious controversies where the writings of the unsuccessful party were carefully suppressed or perished through neglect, authentic history is almost silent), whether he was actuated by a rude aversion to what perhaps can hardly yet be called the fine arts with which Christianity was associating itself, or by a spiritual disdain and impatience of the degrading superstition into which the religion of the Gospel had so long been degenerating, the attempt was as politically unwise and unseasonable as the means employed were despotic and altogether unequal to the end. The time was passed, if it had ever been, when an imperial edict could change, or even much affect, the actual prevailing religion of the empire. For this was no speculative article of belief, no question of high metaphysical theology, but a total change in the universal popular worship, in the spirit and in the essence, if not of the daily ritual, of countless observances and habitual practices of devotion. It swept away from

almost all the churches of the Empire objects hallowed by devotion, and supposed to be endowed with miraculous agency; objects of hope and fear, of gratitude and immemorial veneration. It not merely invaded the public church, and left its naked walls without any of the old remembrancers of faith and piety; it reached the private sanctuary of prayer. No one could escape the proscription; learned or unlearned, priest or peasant, monk or soldier, clergyman or layman, man, woman, and even child, were involved in the strife. Something to which their religious attachments clung, to which their religious passions were wedded, might at any time be forcibly rent away, insulted, trampled under foot; that which had been their pride and delight could only now be furtively visited, and under the fear of detection.

Nor was it possible for this controversy to vent itself in polemic writings; to exhaust the mutual hatred which it engendered in fierce invectives, which, Nature of the controversy. however they might provoke, were not necessarily followed by acts of conflict and bloodshed. Here actual, personal, furious collision of man and man, of faction and faction, of armed troops against armed troops, was inevitable. The contending parties did not assail each other with mutual anathemas, which they might despise, or excommunication and counter-excommunication, the validity of which might be questioned by either party. On one side it was a sacred obligation to destroy, to mutilate, to dash to pieces, to deface the objects on which the other had so long gazed with intense devotion, and which he might think it an equally sacred obligation to defend at the sacrifice of life. It was not a controversy, it was a feud; not a polemic strife, but actual war declared by one part of Christendom against the other. It was well perhaps for Christendom that the parties were not more equally balanced; that, right or wrong, one party in that division of the Christian world, where total change would have been almost extermination, obtained a slow but complete triumph.

In all the controversies, moreover, in which the Emperors had been involved, whether they had plunged into them of their own accord, or had been compelled to take

a reluctant part;—whether they embraced the orthodox or the erroneous opinions,—they had found a large faction, both of the clergy and the people, already enlisted in the cause. In this case they had to create their own faction; and though so many of the clergy, from conviction, fear, or interest, became Iconoclasts, as to form a council respectable for its numbers; though, among some part of the people, an Iconoclastic fanaticism broke out, yet it was no spontaneous movement on their part. The impulse, to all appearance, emanated directly from the emperor. It was not called forth by any general expression of aversion to the existing superstition by any body of the clergy, or by any single bold reformer: it was announced, it was enacted in that character of Supreme Head of the Empire, which was still supposed to be vested in the Cæsar, and had descended to him as part of his inheritance from his pagan predecessors. This sovereignty comprehended religious as well as temporal autocracy; and of this the clergy, though they had often resisted it, and virtually, perhaps, held it to be abrogated, had never formally, publicly, or deliberately, declined the jurisdiction. It is a proof of the strong will and commanding abilities of the great Iconoclastic Emperors, that they could effect, and so long maintain, such a revolution, by their sole authority, throughout at least their eastern dominions.

And there was this irremediable weakness in the cause of Iconoclasm. It was a mere negative doctrine, a proscription of those sentiments which had full possession of the popular mind, without any strong countervailing religious excitement. There was none of that appeal to principles like those of the Reformation, to the Bible, to justification by faith, to the individual sense of responsibility. The senses were robbed of their habitual and cherished objects of devotion, but there was no awakening of an inner life of intense and passionate piety. The cold naked walls from whence the Scriptural histories had been effaced, the despoiled shrines, the mutilated images, could not compel the mind to a more pure and immaterial conception of God and the Saviour. It was a premature

Rationalism, enforced upon an unreasoning age—an attempt to spiritualise by law and edict a generation which had been unspiritualised by centuries of materialistic devotion. Hatred of images, in the process of the strife, might become, as it did, a fanaticism—it could never become a religion. Iconoclasm might proscribe idolatry, but it had no power of kindling a purer faith.

The consequences of this new religious dissension were of the utmost political importance, both in the East and in the West. In the East, instead of <sup>its consequences.</sup> consolidating the strength of Christendom in one great confederacy against invading Mohammedanism, it distracted the thoughts of men from their more pressing dangers, weakened the military energy which, under the Isaurian race of emperors, seemed likely to revive, depopularised with at least one half of their subjects, sovereigns of such great ability as Leo and Constantine Copronymus (whose high qualities for empire pierce through the clouds which are spread over their names by hostile annalists); and finally by adding a new element of animosity to the domestic intrigues within the palace, interrupted the regular succession, and darkened the annals of the empire with new crimes.

But its more important results were the total disruption of the bond between the East and the West—the severance of the Italian province from the Byzantine Empire; the great accession of power to the Papacy, which took the lead in this revolution; the introduction of the Frankish kings into the politics of Italy; and eventually the establishment of the Western Empire under Charlemagne.

Yet this question, thus prematurely agitated by the Iconoclastic emperors, and at this period of Christianity so fatally mistimed, is one of the most grave, and, it should seem, inevitable controversies, arising out of our religion. It must be judged by a more calm and profound philosophy than could be possible in times of actual strife between two impassioned and adverse factions. It is a conflict of two great principles, which it is difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, there can be no doubt that

with ignorant and superstitious minds, the use, the reverence, the worship of images, whether in pictures or statues, invariably degenerates into idolatry. The Church may draw fine and ærial distinctions between images as objects of reverence and objects of adoration; as incentives to the worship of more remote and immaterial beings, or as actual indwelling deities; it may nicely define the feeling which images ought to awaken;—but the intense and indiscriminating piety of the vulgar either understands not, or utterly disregards these subtleties: it may refuse to sanction, it cannot be said not to encourage, that devotion which cannot and will not weigh and measure either its emotions or its language. Image worship in the mass of the people, of the whole monkhood at this time, was undeniably the worship of the actual, material, present image, rather than that of the remote, formless, or spiritual power, of which it was the emblem or representative. It has continued, and still continues, to be in many parts of Christendom this gross and unspiritual adoration; it is a part of the general system of divine worship. The whole tendency of popular belief was to localise, to embody in the material thing the supernatural or divine power; the healing or miraculous influence dwelt in, and emanated from, the picture of the saint—the special, individual picture—it was contained within the relic, and flowed directly from it. These outward things were not mere occasional vehicles of the divine bounty, indifferent in themselves, they possessed an inherent, inalienable sanctity. Where the image was, there was the saint; he heard the prayer, he was carried in procession to allay the pestilence, to arrest the conflagration, to repel the enemy; he sometimes resumed the functions of life, smiled, or stretched his hand from the wall. An image of the same saint, or of the Virgin, rivalled another image in its wonder-working power, or its mild benignity.

On the other hand, is pure and spiritual Christianity—the highest Christianity to which the human mind can attain—implacably and irreconcilably hostile to the Fine Arts? Is that influence of the majestic and the beautiful awakened through the senses by form, colour, and ex-

pression, to be altogether abandoned? Can the exaltation, the purification of the human soul by Art in no way be allied with true Christian devotion? Is that aid to the realisation of the historic truths of our religion, by representations, vivid, speaking, almost living, to be utterly proscribed? Is that idealism which grows out of and nourishes reverential feelings, to rest solely on the contemplation of pure spirit, without any intermediate human, yet superhumanised, form? Because the ignorant or fraudulent monk has ascribed miraculous power to his Madonna, or the image of his patron saint, and the populace have knelt before it in awe which it is impossible to distinguish from adoration, is Christianity to cast off as alien to its highest development, the divine creations of Raffaele, or of Correggio? Are we inexorably to demand the same sublime spiritualism from the more or less imaginative races or classes of mankind?

This great question lies indeed at the bottom of the antagonism between those two descriptions of believers; to a certain extent, between the religion of southern and that of northern Europe, between that of the races of Roman and some of those of Teutonic descent; to a certain extent that of the inhabitants of towns or villages, and rude mountaineers; finally, between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

But since, in the progress of civilisation, the fine arts will no doubt obtain, if not greater influence, more general admiration, religion must either break off entirely all association with these dangerous friends, and the fine arts abandon the most fertile and noblest field for their development; or their mutual relations must be amicably adjusted; a finer sense of their inherent harmony must arise; the blended feelings which they excite must poise themselves far above the vulgar superstition of idolatry while they retain the force and intensity of devotional reverence. The causes which may be expected to work this sacred reconciliation may be the growing intelligence of mankind, greater familiarity with the written Scriptures; and, paradoxical as it may sound, but as may hereafter appear, greater perfection in the arts themselves,

or a finer apprehension of that perfection in ancient as in modern art.

Doubtless, the pure, unmingled, spiritual notion of the Deity was the elementary principle of Christianity. It had repudiated all the anthropomorphic images, which to the early Jews had impersonated and embodied, if it had not to grosser minds materialised, the Godhead, and reduced him to something like an earthly sovereign, only enthroned in heaven in more dazzling pomp and magnificence. Even the localisation of the Deity in the temple or the tabernacle, a step towards materialisation, had been abrogated by the Saviour himself. Neither Samaria nor Jerusalem was to be any longer a peculiar dwelling place of the Universal Father.

Throughout the early controversy on image worship, there was a stedfast determination to keep the Parent and Primal Deity aloof from external form. No similitude of the unseen, incomprehensible Father, was permitted for many centuries;\* even in a symbolic form, as in the vision of Ezekiel, which Raffaele and some of the later painters have ventured to represent. It should seem, that even if the artists had been equal to the execution, the subject would have been thought presumptuous or profane.<sup>b</sup>

But if Christianity was thus in its language and in its primal conception so far superior in its spirituality to the religion of the Old Testament, it had itself its peculiar anthropomorphism; it had its visible, material, corporeal revelation of the Deity. God himself, according to its universal theory, had condescended to the human form.<sup>c</sup> Christ's whole agency, his birth, his infancy, his life, and his death, had been cognisable to the senses of his human brethren in the flesh. If, from the language of the Scriptures, descriptive of all those wonderful acts of

\* "Cur tandem patrem domini Jesu Christi non oculis subicimus, et pingimus, quoniam quod sit non novimus, Deique natura spectanda proponi non potest ac pingi. Quod si eum intuiti essemus ac novissemus prout filium ejus, illum quoque spectandum proponere potuissemus, ac pingere, ut et illius imaginem idolum appellarea."

—Greg. II. Epist. i., ad Leon. Imper. p. 14.

<sup>b</sup> See the chapter in the History of Christianity on the Fine Arts, vol. iii. p. 486 *et seq.*, and Didron, *Iconographie Chrétienne*.

<sup>c</sup> οὐ τὴν ἀσάρετον εἰκονίζω θείοντα, ἀλλ' εἰκονίζω θεοῦ τὴν ἐκδηύσαν σάρκα. —Joann. Damascen., *Orat. de Imag.* 1.

power, of mercy, and of suffering, the imagination might realise to itself his actual form, motions, demeanour, the patient majesty in death, the dignity after the resurrection, the incipient glory in the ascension, and worship that mental image as the actual incarnate Godhead, why might not that which was thus first embodied in inspired language, and thence endowed with life by the creative faculty of the mind, be fixed in colour and in stone, and so be preserved from evanescence, so arrayed in permanent ideal being? Form and colour were but another language addressed to the eye, not to the ear. While the Saviour was on earth, the divinity within his human form demanded the intensest devotion, the highest worship which man could offer to God. The Saviour thus revived by the phantasy, even as he was in the flesh, might justly demand the same homage. When that image became again actual form, did the material accessories—the vehicle of stone or colour—so far prevail over the ideal conception, as to harden into an idol that which, as a mental conception, might lawfully receive man's devotions? It seemed to awaken only the same emotions, which were not merely pardonable, but in the highest degree pious in the former case: why, then, forbidden or idolatrous in the latter?<sup>a</sup>

The same argument which applied to the Saviour, applied with still greater force to those merely human beings, the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, the apostles, the saints, the martyrs, even to the Virgin herself. Why should not their histories be related by forms and colours, as well as by words? It was but presenting the same truths to the mind through another sense. If they were unduly worshipped, the error was in the hagiolatry, or adoration of saints, not in the adoration of the image. Pictures were but the books of the un-

<sup>a</sup> This argument is urged by Gregory II. in his epistle to Germanus at great length: "Enarrent illa et per voces, et per literas, et per picturas." So Germanus: ἅσπερ διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἀληθῆ πνευμαίνονται ταῦτα καὶ διὰ γραφικῆς μιμήσεως πρὸς βεβαιώσεσιν ἡμῶν πληροφορίας συνιστάμεται.—Epist. ad Joann. Episc. Synod.

They argued that this was an argument for Christ's real humanity against the Docetic sects. Their favourite authority was Basil: ἃ γὰρ ὁ λόγος τῆς ἰστορίας διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς παρίστανει, ταῦτα γραφῇ εἰσαύγουσα διὰ μιμήσεως δίδυνει. So also Joann. Damasc. : ὅτι τῇ ἀκοῇ ὁ λόγος, ταῦτο τῇ ὁράσει ἡ εἰκὼν.

learned; preachers never silent of the glory of the saints, and instructing with soundless voice the beholders, and so sanctifying the vision. "I am too poor to possess books, I have no leisure for reading: I enter the church, choked with the cares of the world, the glowing colours attract my sight and delight my eyes, like a flowery meadow; and the glory of God steals imperceptibly into my soul: I gaze on the fortitude of the martyr and the crown with which he is rewarded, and the fire of holy emulation kindles within me, and I fall down and worship God through the martyr, and I receive salvation."\* Thus argues the most eloquent defender of images, betraying in his ingenious argument the rudeness of the arts, and the uncultivated taste, not of the vulgar alone. It is the brilliancy of the colours, not the truth or majesty of the design, which enthralles the sight. And, so in general, the ruder the art the more intense the superstition. The perfection of the fine arts leads rather to diminish than to promote such superstition. Not merely does the cultivation of mind required for their higher execution, as well as the admiration of them, imply an advanced state, but the idealism, which is their crowning excellence, in some degree unrealises them, and creates a different and more exalted feeling. There is more direct idolatry paid to the rough and ill-shapen image, or the flat, unrelieved, and staring picture,—the former actually clothed in gaudy and tinsel ornaments, the latter with the crown of gold leaf on the head, and real or artificial flowers in the hand,—than to the noblest ideal statue, or the Holy Family with all the magic of light and shade. They are not the fine paintings which work miracles, but the coarse and smoke-darkened boards, on which the dim outline of form is hardly to be traced. Thus it may be said, that it was the superstition which required the images, rather than the images which formed the superstition. The

\* ὅτι βιβλὸι τοῖς ἀρχαῖοις οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀποστολῆς, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων τιμῆς ἀσκήτου κήρυξις, ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ φωνῆ τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς διδασκόμενοι, καὶ τὴν θεασιν ἀγαθούσαι. οὐκ ἐντολῶν βιβλίων, οὐ σχολῆν ἄνω πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν εἶμι εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ψυχῶν ἱατροῦ, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὥσπερ ἀπάνθρωποι τοῖς λογισμοῖς συνεπινοήσαντες, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς θεὸν τῆς γραφῆς

τὸ ἄνθος, καὶ ὡς λιμὸν τίττω τὴν θεασιν, καὶ λιληθόσας ἱναφίσις τῇ ψυχῇ δάξω θεοῦ. τιλίαι τὴν καρτερίαν τοῦ μάρτυρος, τῶν στήθεων τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν, καὶ ὡς σκεπὶ πρὸς ἕλκωσιν ἐκείνομαι τῇ προθυμίᾳ, καὶ σίσταναι σκεπνυῖν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ μάρτυρος, καὶ λαμβάνω τὴν σωτηρίαν. — Joann. Damascen. de Imag. Orat. ii. p. 747.

Christian mind would have found some other fetiche, to which it would have attributed miraculous powers. Relics would have been more fervently worshipped, and endowed with more transcendent powers, without the adventitious good, the familiarising the mind with the historic truths of Scripture, or even the legends of Christian martyrs, which at least allayed the evil of the actual idolatry. Iconoclasm left the worship of relics, and other dubious memorials of the saints, in all their vigour; while it struck at that which, after all, was a higher kind of idolatry. It aspired not to elevate the general mind above superstition, but proscribed only one, and that not the most debasing, form.

Of the emperors Leo the Isaurian and his son Constantine, the great Iconoclasts, the only historians are their enemies. That the founder of this dynasty Leo the Isaurian, A.D. 717. was of obscure birth, from a district, or rather the borders, of the wild province of Isauria, enhances rather than detracts from the dignity of his character. Among the adventurers who from time to time rose to the throne of Byzantium, none employed less unworthy means, or were less stained with crime, than Leo. Throughout his early career the inimical historians are overawed by involuntary respect for his great military and administrative His character. qualities. He had been employed on various dangerous and important services, and the jealousy of the ruling emperor, on more than one occasion, shows that he was already designated by the public voice as one capable of empire. Justinian II. abandoned him with a few troops, in an expedition against the Alani; from this difficulty he extricated himself with consummate courage and dexterity. He appears equally distinguished in valour and in craft. In the most trying situations his incomparable address is as prompt as decisive; against treacherous enemies he does not scruple to employ treachery.

The elevation of an active and enterprising soldier to the throne was imperiously demanded by the times, and hailed with general applause. The first measures of Leo were to secure the tottering empire against her most formidable enemies the Mohammedans, who were encom-

passing Constantinople on every side. Never had the Byzantine Empire been exposed to such peril as during the siege of Constantinople by Moslemah; nothing but the indefatigable courage, military skill, and restless activity of Leo, aided by the new invention of the Greek fire, saved the eastern capital from falling five centuries before its time into the hands of the Mohammedans.<sup>f</sup> There can be no greater praise to Leo than that his superstitious subjects saw nothing less than the manifest interposition of the tutelary Virgin throughout their unexpected deliverance.

Leo had reigned for ten years before he declared his hostility to image worship. But his persecuting spirit had betrayed itself in the compulsory baptism of the Jews and the Montanists (probably some Manichean sect called by that ancient name) in Constantinople.<sup>g</sup> The effect of these persecutions was not encouraging; the Jews secretly washed off the contamination of baptism, and instead of fasting before the Holy Communion, polluted its sanctity, if they did not annul its blessings, by eating common food. The Montanists burned themselves in their houses. In an orthodox emperor, however, these acts would have passed without reprobation, if not with praise.

At the close of these ten years in the reign of Leo Christendom was astounded by the sudden proscription of its common religious usages. The edict came forth, interdicting all worship of images. Leo was immediately asserted and believed to be as hostile to the adoration of the Virgin, to the worship of saints and of relics, as to that of images.<sup>h</sup> In the common ear the emperor's language was that of a Jew or a Mohammedan, and fables were soon current that the impulse came from those odious quarters. It was rumoured that while Leo was yet an obscure Isaurian youth named Conon, two Jews met him and promised him the empire of the world if he would grant them one request: this was, to destroy the

<sup>f</sup> Theophanes passim.

<sup>g</sup> Ib., p. 336.

<sup>h</sup> οὐ μόνον γὰρ περὶ τὴν σχιτικὴν τῶν σικτῶν εἰκότων ἡ δυσσεβὴς ἱερῶν λειψάνων κύνησις, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν περιβιῶν τῆς

πανόγκου θεοτόκου, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων· καὶ τὰ λείψανα αὐτῶν ὁ παμμίαιρος, ὡς οἱ διδάσκαλοι αὐτοῦ "Αρεβίς, ἰβδιδιόγνιστο.— Theoph. p. 625.

images throughout Christendom.<sup>1</sup> They bound him by an oath in a Christian church! After the young Conon had ascended the throne, he was called on to fulfil his solemn vow. The prototype of the Christian Emperor in Iconoclasm had been the Sultan Yezid of Damascus. Yezid had been promised by a magician a reign of forty years over the Mohammedan world on the single condition of the destruction of images. God had cut off the Mohammedan in the beginning of his impiety, but Leo only followed this sacrilegious and fatal example. His adviser was said to be a certain Besor, a Syrian renegade from Christianity, deeply imbued with Mohammedan antipathies. The real motives of Leo it is impossible to conjecture. Had the rude soldier been brought up in a simpler Christianity among the mountains of his native Isauria? Had the perpetual contrast between the sterner creed and plainer worship of Mohammedanism and the paganised Christianity of his day led him to inquire whether this was the genuine and primitive religion of the Gospel? Had he felt that he could not deny the justice of the charges of idolatry so prodigally made against his religion by the Jews and Mohammedans, and so become anxious to relieve it from this imputation? Had he found his subjects, instead of trusting, in their imminent danger from the Mohammedan invasion, to their own arms, discipline and courage, entirely reposing on the intercession of the Virgin and the saints and on the magic influence of crosses and pictures? Did he act as statesman, general, or zealot, he pursued his aim with inflexible resolution, though not in the first instance without some caution.

For the war which the emperor declared against the images did not at first command their destruction.

The first edict prohibited the worship, but only A.D. 726.  
the worship, of all statues and pictures which represented the Saviour, the Virgin, and the saints. The statues and

<sup>1</sup> And this was the emperor whose first religious act was the persecution of the Jews. Neither Pope Gregory nor any of the Western writers, nor even Theophanes, the earliest Byzantine, knew anything of this story. The first version

is in a very doubtful oration ascribed to John of Damascus, passes through Glycas and Constantine Manasses, till the fable attains its full growth in Zonaras and Cedrenus. Theophanes gives the story of the Sultan Yezid.

those pictures which hung upon the walls, and were not painted upon them, were to be raised to a greater height, so as not to receive pious kisses or other marks of adoration.\*

About this period an alarming volcanic eruption took place in the *Ægean*; the whole atmosphere was dark as midnight, the sea and the adjacent islands strewn with showers of ashes and of stones. A new island suddenly arose amid this awful convulsion. The Emperor beheld in this terrific phenomenon the divine wrath, and attributed it to his patient acquiescence in the idolatry of his subjects. The monks, on the other hand, the implacable adversaries of the emperor, and the most ardent defenders of image worship, beheld God's fearful rebuke against the sacrilegious imperial edicts.<sup>m</sup>

The first edict was followed, at what interval it is difficult to determine, by a second of far greater severity. It commanded the total destruction of all images,<sup>n</sup> the whitewashing the walls of the churches. But if the first edict was everywhere received with the most determined aversion, the second maddened the image worshippers, the mass of mankind, including most of the clergy and all the monks, to absolute fury. In the capital the presence of the emperor did not in the least overawe the populace. An imperial officer had orders to destroy a statue of the Saviour in a part of Constantinople called *Chalcopratia*. This image was renowned for its miracles. The thronging multitude, chiefly of women, saw with horror the officer mount the ladder. Thrice he struck with his impious axe

\* Unfortunately, none of the earlier edicts of the Iconoclastic emperors are extant. It is doubtful, and of course obstinately disputed, whether Leo condescended to require the sanction of any council or synod, or of any number of bishops.—Walch, p. 229.

<sup>m</sup> The chronology of these events is in the highest degree obscure. Baronius, Maimbourg, the Pagis, Spanheim, Basnage, Walch, have endeavoured to arrange them in natural and regular sequence. The commencement of the actual strife in the tenth year of Leo's reign gives one certain date, A.D. 726.

The death of Pope Gregory II. another, A.D. 731. The great difficulty is the time at which the second more severe edict followed the first. Some place it as late as 731; but it had manifestly been issued before the first epistle of Gregory. It seems to me as clear that it preceded the tumult at Constantinople, which arose from an attempt to destroy an image; but destruction does not seem to have been commanded by the earlier and milder edict.

<sup>n</sup> Anastasius adds that they were to be burned in the most public place in the different cities.—Vit. Greg. II.

the holy countenance, which had so benignly looked down upon them. Heaven interfered not, as no doubt they expected; but the women seized the ladder, threw down the officer, and beat him to death with clubs. The emperor sent an armed guard to suppress the tumult; a frightful massacre took place. But the slain were looked upon, some were afterwards worshipped, as martyrs in the holy cause. In religious insurrections that which with one party is suppression of rebellion, with the other is persecution. Leo becomes, in the orthodox histories, little better than a Saracen; the pious are punished with mutilations, scourgings, exile, confiscation; the schools of learning were closed, a magnificent library burned to the ground. This last is no doubt a fable; and the cruelties of Leo were at least told with the darkest colouring. Even his successes in war were ingeniously turned to his condemnation. The failure of the Saracens in an attack on Nicea was, as usual, attributed to the intervention of the Virgin, not to the valiant resistance of the garrison. The Virgin was content with the death of a soldier who had dared to throw down and trample on her statue. She had appeared to him and foretold his death. The next day her prophecy was fulfilled, his brains were beat out by a stone from a mangonel. But the magnanimity of the Virgin did not therefore withdraw her tutelary protection from the city; Nicea escaped, though Leo, besides his disrespect for images, is likewise charged with doubting the intercession of the Mother of God.

Nor did this open resistance take place in Constantinople alone. A formidable insurrection broke out in Greece and in the Ægean islands. A fleet was armed, a new emperor, one Cosmas, proclaimed, and Constantinople menaced by the rebels. The fleet, however, was scattered and destroyed by ships which discharged the Greek fire, the insurrection was suppressed, the leaders either fell or were executed, along with the usurper.\* The monks here, and throughout the empire, the champions of this as of every other superstition, were the instigators to rebellion. Few monasteries were without some wonder-working

\* Theoph. Chronograph., p. 629.

image; the edict struck at once at their influence, their interest, their pride, their most profound religious feelings.

But the more eminent clergy were likewise at first almost unanimous in their condemnation of the emperor. Claudius, bishop of Natolia, indeed, is branded as his adviser. Another bishop, Theodosius, son of Apsimar, Metropolitan of Ephesus, is named as entering into the war against images. But almost for the first time the bishops of the two Romes, Germanus of Constantinople, and Pope Gregory II., were united in one common cause. Leo attempted to win Germanus to his views, but the aged patriarch (he was now 95 years old) calmly but resolutely resisted the arguments, the promises, the menaces of the emperor.

But the conduct of Gregory II., as leading to more important results, demands more rigid scrutiny. The Byzantine historians represent him as proceeding, at the first intimation of the hostility of the emperor to image worship, to an act of direct revolt, as prohibiting the payment of tribute by the Italian province.<sup>p</sup> This was beyond the power, probably beyond the courage, of Gregory. The great results of the final separation of the West from the inefficient and inglorious sovereignty of the East might excuse or palliate, if he had foreseen them, the disloyalty of Pope Gregory to Leo. But it would be to estimate his political and religious sagacity too highly to endow him with this gift of ambitious prophecy, to suppose him anticipating the full development of Latin Christianity when it should become independent of the East. Like most ordinary minds, and, if we are to judge by his letters, Gregory's was a very ordinary mind, he was merely governed by the circumstances and passions of his time without the least foreknowledge of the result of his actions. The letter of Pope Gregory to the emperor is arrogant without dignity, dogmatic without persuasiveness; in the stronger part of the argument far inferior, both in skill and ingenuity, to that of the aged Germanus, or the writer who guided his pen.<sup>q</sup> The

Letter of  
Gregory II.  
A.D. 729.

<sup>p</sup> Theophanes, followed by the later writers.

<sup>q</sup> Compare the two letters of Ger-

manus to John of Synnada, and to Thomas of Claudiopolis.—*Conc. Nic. ii. sess. iv.*

strange mistakes in the history of the Old Testament, the still stranger interpretations of the New, the loose legends which are advanced as history, give a very low opinion of the knowledge of the times. As a great public document, addressed to the whole Christian world by him who aspired to be the first ecclesiastic, we might be disposed to question its authenticity, if it were not avouched by the full evidence in its favour, and its agreement with all the events of the period. After some praise of the golden promise of orthodoxy, in the declaration of Leo on ascending the throne, and in his conduct up to a certain period, the Pope proceeds, "For ten years you have paid no attention to the images which you now denounce as idols, and whose total destruction and abolition you command. Not the faithful only but infidels are scandalised at your impiety. Christ has condemned those who offend one of his little ones, you fear not to offend the whole world. You say that God has forbidden the worship of things made with hands; who worships them? Why, as emperor and head of Christendom, have you not consulted the wise? The Scriptures, the fathers, the six councils, you treat with equal contempt. These are the coarse and rude arguments suited to a coarse and rude mind like yours, but they contain the truth." Gregory then enters at length into the Mosaic interdiction of idolatry. "The idols of the Gentiles only were forbidden in the commandment, not such images as the Cherubim and Seraphim, or the ornaments made by Bezaleel to the glory of God." It is impossible without irreverence to translate the argument of the Pope, from the partial vision of God to Moses described in the book of Exodus.\* What follows, if on less dangerous ground, is hardly less strange. "Where the body is, says our Lord, there will the eagles be gathered together. The body is Christ, the eagles the religious men who flew from all quarters to behold him. When they beheld him they made a picture of him. Not of him alone, they made

\* "Si videris me, morieris; sed ascende per foramen petrae et videbis posteriora mea." Gregory no doubt understood this in an awfully mysterious sense, but not without a materialising

tendency. The whole Godhead was revealed in Christ, "nostrarum generationum ætate in novissimis temporibus manifestum seipsum, et posteriora simul et anteriora perfecte nobis ostendit."

pictures of James the brother of the Lord, of Stephen, and of all the martyrs; and so having done, they disseminated them throughout the world to receive not worship but reverence." Was this ignorance in Gregory, or effrontery? He then appeals to the likeness of Christ sent to Abgarus, king of Edessa. "God the Father cannot be painted, as his form is not known. Were it known and painted, would you call that an idol?" The pope appeals to the tears of devotion which he himself has shed while gazing on the statue of St. Peter. He denies that the Catholics worship wood and stone, these are memorials only intended to awaken pious feelings.\* They adore them not as gods, for in them they have no hope, they only employ their intercession. "Go," he then breaks out in this contemptuous tone, "Go into a school where children are learning their letters and proclaim yourself a destroyer of images, they would all throw their tablets at your head, and you would thus be taught by these foolish ones what you refuse to learn from the wise." It might be asked what well-instructed children now would say to a pope who mistook Hezekiah (called Uzziah) for a wicked king, his destroying the brazen serpent for an act of impiety, and asserted that David placed the brazen serpent in the *Temple*. "You boast that as Hezekiah after 800 years cast out the brazen serpent from the temple, so after 800 years you have cast out the idols from the churches. Hezekiah truly was your brother, as self-willed, and, like thee, daring to offer violence to the priests of God." "With the power given me by St. Peter," proceeds Gregory, "I could inflict punishment upon you, but since thou hast heaped a curse on thyself, I leave thee to endure it." The pope returns to his own edification from beholding the pictures and images in the churches. The passage is of interest, as showing the usual subjects of these paintings. "The miracles of the Lord; the Virgin Mother, with the infant Jesus on her breast, surrounded by choirs of angels; the Last Supper; the Raising of Lazarus; the miracles of giving sight to the blind; the curing the paralytic and

\* οὐ λατρίῃς ἀλλὰ ἐχρίσιν, "non latriâ sed habitudine." This is the inviolable distinction.

the leper; the feeding the multitudes in the desert; the transfiguration; the crucifixion, burial, resurrection, ascension of Christ; the gift of the Holy Ghost; the sacrifice of Isaac, which seems to have been thought, doubtless as typifying the Redeemer's death, a most pathetic subject." The pope then reproaches Leo for not consulting the aged and venerable Germanus, and for listening rather to that Ephesian fool the son of Apsimar. The wise influence of Germanus had persuaded Constantine, the son of Constans, to summon the sixth council. There the emperor had declared that he would sit, a humble hearer, to execute the decrees of the prelates, and to banish those whom they condemned. "If his father had erred from the faith he would be the first to anathematise him." So met the sixth council. "The doctrines of the Church are in the province of the bishops, not of the emperor: as the prelates should abstain from affairs of state, so princes from those of the Church." "You demand a council:—revoke your edicts, cease to destroy images, a council will not be needed." Gregory then relates the insult to the image of the Saviour in Constantinople. "Not only those who were present at that sacrilegious scene, but even the barbarians had revenged themselves on the statues of the emperor, which had before been received in Italy with great honour. Hence the invasion of the Lombards, their occupation of Ravenna, their menaces that they would advance and seize Rome. "It is your own folly which has disabled you from defending Rome; and you would terrify us and threaten to send to Rome, and break in pieces the statue of St. Peter, and carry away Pope Gregory in chains, as Constans did his predecessor Martin. Knowest thou not that the popes have been the barrier-wall between the East and the West—the mediators of peace? I will not enter into a contest. I have but to retire four-and-twenty miles into Campania, and you may as well follow the winds. The officer who persecuted Pope Martin was cut off in his sins; Martin

<sup>1</sup> "Scis sanctæ ecclesiæ dogmata non imperatorum esse, sed pontificum: idcirco ecclesiis præpositi sunt pontifices a reipublicæ negotiis abstinentes, et im-

peratores ergo similiter ab ecclesiasticis abstineant, et quæ sibi commissa sunt, capeant." This was new doctrine in the East.

in exile was a saint, and miracles are performed at his tomb in the Chersonese. Would that I might share the fate of Martin. But, for the statue of St. Peter, which all the kingdoms of the West esteem as a *god on earth*, the whole West would take a terrible revenge.\* I have but to retire and despise your threats; but I warn you that I shall be guiltless of the blood that will be shed; on your head it will fall. May God instil his fear into your heart! May I soon receive letters announcing your conversion! May the Saviour dwell in your heart, drive away those who urge you to these scandals, and restore peace to the world!"†

If Gregory expected this expostulatory and defiant epistle to work any change in Leo, he was doomed to disappointment. In a subsequent, but shorter letter, he attempted to appall the emperor by the great names of Gregory the Wonder-worker, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory the Theologian, of Basil, and of Chrysostom, to whose authority he appealed as sanctioning the worship of images. He held up the pious examples of those obedient sons of the Church, Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great, Valentinian the Great, and Constantine who held the sixth council. "What are our churches but things made with hands, of stone, wood, straw, clay, lime; but they are adorned with paintings of the miracles wrought by the saints, the passion of the Lord, his glorious mother, his apostles. On these pictures men spend their whole fortunes; and men and women, with newly-baptised children in their arms, and grown up youths from all parts of the world come, and, pointing out these histories, lift up their minds and hearts to God." The pope renews his earnest admonitions to the emperor to obey the prelates of the Church in all spiritual things. "You persecute us and afflict us with a worldly and carnal arm. We, unarmed

\* "Quam omnia Occidentis regna, velut Deum terrestrem habent." This looks something like idolatry.

† Gregory alludes with triumph to his conquest over the northern kings, who are submitting to baptism from the hands of his missionary, S. Boniface. "Nos viam ingredimur in extremas

occidentis regiones versus illos, qui sanctum baptismum effragitant. Cum enim illuc episcopos misissem, et sanctæ ecclesiæ nostræ clericos, nondum adducti sunt ut capita sua inclinerent et baptizarentur eorum principes, quod exoptent, ut eorum sim susceptor."

and defenceless, can but send a devil to humble you, to deliver you to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, and the salvation of the spirit. Why, you ask, have not the councils *commanded* image-worship? Why have they not commanded us to eat and drink?" (Images, Gregory seems to have considered as necessary to the spiritual as food to the corporeal life.) "Images have been borne by bishops to councils; no religious man goes on a pilgrimage without an image." "Write to all the world that Gregory, the Bishop of Rome, and Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople, are in error concerning images; cast the blame on us, who have received from God the power to bind and to loose."

When Gregory addressed these letters to the Emperor Leo, the tumult in Constantinople, the first public act of rebellion against Iconoclasm, had taken place; but the aged Bishop Germanus was not yet degraded from his see. Germanus, with better temper and more Degradation of Germanus. skilful argument, had defended the images of the East.<sup>a</sup> Before his death he was deposed or compelled to retire from his see. He died most probably in peace, A.D. 731. his extreme age may well account for his death. His personal ill-treatment by the emperor is the legend of a later age to exalt him into a martyr.<sup>a</sup>

But these two powerful prelates were not the only champions of their cause, whose writings made a strong impression on their age. It is singular that the most admired defender of images in the East, was a subject not of the emperor but of the Mohammedan sultan. John of Damascus was famed as the most learned man in the East, and it may show either the tolerance, John of Damascus. the ignorance, or the contempt of the Mohammedans for these Christian controversies, that writings which became celebrated all over the East, should issue from one of their capital cities, Damascus.<sup>b</sup>

The ancestors of John, according to his biographer, when Damascus fell into the hands of the Arabs, had

<sup>a</sup> Compare his letters in Mansi, in the report of the Second Council of Nicea.

<sup>a</sup> Cedrenus, iv. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Vit. Joann. Damasceni, prefixed to his works.

almost alone remained faithful to Christianity. They commanded the respect of the conquerors, and were employed in judicial offices of trust and dignity, to administer no doubt the Christian law to the Christian subjects of the sultan. His father, besides this honourable rank, had amassed great wealth ; all this he devoted to the redemption of Christian slaves, on whom he bestowed their freedom. John was the reward of these pious actions. John was made a child of light immediately on his birth. This, as his biographer intimates, was an affair of some difficulty, and required much courage. The father was anxious to keep his son aloof from the savage habits of war and piracy, to which the youth of Damascus were addicted, and to devote him to the pursuit of knowledge. The Saracen pirates of the sea-shore, neighbouring to Damascus, swept the Mediterranean and brought in Christian captives from all quarters. A monk named Cosmas had the misfortune to fall into the hands of these freebooters. He was set apart for death, when his executioners, Christian slaves no doubt, fell at his feet, and entreated his intercession with the Redeemer. The Saracens inquired of Cosmas who he was. He replied that he had not the dignity of a priest, he was a simple monk, and burst into tears. The father of John was standing by, and asked, not without wonder, how one already dead to the world could weep so bitterly for the loss of life ? The monk answered, that he did not weep for his life, but for the treasures of knowledge which would be buried with him in the grave. He then recounted all his attainments : he was a proficient in rhetoric, logic, in the moral philosophy of Aristotle and of Plato, in natural philosophy, in arithmetic, geometry, and music, and in astronomy. From astronomy he had risen to the mysteries of theology, and was versed in all the divinity of the Greeks. He could not but lament that he was to die without leaving an heir to his vast patrimony of science, to die an unprofitable servant who had wasted his talent. The father of John begged the life of the monk from the Saracen governor, gave him at once his freedom, placed him in his family, and confided to him the education of his son. The pupil in time exhausted

all the acquirements of his teacher. The monk assured the father of John that his son surpassed himself in every branch of knowledge. Cosmas entreated to be dismissed, that he might henceforth dedicate himself to that higher philosophy, to which the youthful John had pointed his way. He retired to the desert, to the monastery of St. Saba, where he would have closed his days in peace, had he not been compelled to take on himself the Bishopric of Maiuma.

The attainments of the young John of Damascus commanded the veneration of the Saracens, he was compelled reluctantly to accept an office of still higher trust and dignity than that held by his father. As the Iconoclastic controversy became more violent, John of Damascus entered the field against the emperor. His three orations in favour of image-worship were disseminated with the utmost activity throughout Christendom.

The biographer of John brings a charge of base and treacherous revenge against the emperor. It is one of those legends of which the monkish East is so fertile, and cannot be traced, even in allusion, to any document earlier than the life of John. Leo having obtained, through his emissaries, one of John's circular epistles in his own handwriting, caused a letter to be forged, containing a proposal from John of Damascus to betray his native city to the Christians. The emperor, with specious magnanimity, sent this letter to the sultan. The indignant Mohammedan ordered the guilty hand of John to be cut off, a mild punishment for such a treason! John entreated that the hand might be restored to him, knelt before an image of the Virgin, prayed, fell asleep, and woke with his hand as before. The miracle convinced the sultan of his innocence: he was reinstated in his place of honour. But John yearned for monastic retirement. He too withdrew to the monastery of St. Saba. There a severe abbot put his humility and his obedience to the sternest test. He was sent in the meanest and most beggarly attire to sell baskets in the market-place of Damascus, where he had been accustomed to appear in the dignity of office, and to vend this poor ware at exorbitant prices. As a penance for an act of kindness to a dying brother, he was set to

clean the filth from all the cells of his brethren. An opportune vision rebuked the abbot for thus wasting the splendid talents of his inmate. John was allowed to devote himself to religious poetry, which was greatly admired, and to his theologic arguments in defence of images.

The fame of this wonder of his age rests chiefly on these writings, of which the extensive popularity attests their power over the minds of his readers. His courage in opposing the emperor, and in asserting the superior authority of the Church in all ecclesiastic affairs, considering that he was secure either in Damascus or in his monastery, and a subject of the Saracenic kingdom, is by no means astonishing. Orations of John. The three famous orations repeat, with but slight variations, each after the other, the same arguments; some the ordinary and better arguments for the practice, expressed with greater ingenuity and elegance than by the other writers of the day, occasionally with surpassing force and beauty, not without a liberal admixture of irrelevant and puerile matter; the same invectives against his opponents, as if by refusing to worship the images of Christ, his mother, and the saints, they refused to worship the venerable beings themselves. Pictures are great standing memorials of triumph over the devil; whoever destroys these memorials is a friend of the devil; to reprove material images is Manicheism, as betraying the hatred of matter which is the first tenet of that odious heresy. It was a kind of Docetism, too, asserting the unreality of the body of the Saviour. At the close of each oration occurs almost the same citation of authorities, not omitting the memorable one of the Hermit, who was assailed by the demon of uncleanness. The demon offered to leave the holy man at rest if he would cease to worship an image of the Virgin. The hard-pressed hermit made the rash vow, but in his distress of mind communicated his secret to a famous abbot, his spiritual adviser. "Better," said the abbot, "that you should visit every brothel in the town, than abstain from the worship of the holy image."

The third oration concludes with a copious list of miracles wrought by certain images; an argument more favourable

to an incredulous adversary, as showing the wretched superstition into which the worship of images had degenerated and as tending to fix the accusation of idolatry.

From the death of Leo the Isaurian the history of Iconoclasm belongs exclusively to the East, until the Council of Frankfort interfered to regulate the worship of images in the Transalpine parts of Europe. Gregory III., the successor of Gregory II., whose pontificate filled up the remaining years of Leo's reign, inflexibly pursued the same policy as his predecessor. In the West, all power, almost all pretension to power, excepting over Sicily and Calabria, expired with Leo ;<sup>o</sup> and this independence partly arose out of, and was immeasurably strengthened by, the faithful adherence of the West to image worship ; but the revolt or alienation of Italy from the Eastern empire will occupy a later chapter in Christian history.

Leo was succeeded by his son Constantine. The name by which this emperor was known is a perpetual testimony to the hatred of a large part of his subjects. Even in his infancy he was believed to have shown a natural aversion to holy things, and in his baptism to have defiled the font. Constantine  
Copronymus. Constantine Copronymus sounded to Greek ears as a constant taunt against his filthy and sacrilegious character.

The accession of Constantine, although he had already been acknowledged for twenty years, with his father, as joint-emperor, met formidable resistance. A.D. 741. The contest for the throne was a strife between the two religious parties which divided the empire. During the absence of Constantine, on an expedition against the Saracens, a sudden and dangerous insurrection placed his brother-in-law, Artavasdus on the throne. Constantinople was gained to the party of the usurper by treachery. The city was induced to submit to Artavasdus only by a rumour, industriously propagated and generally believed, of the death of Constantine. The emperor on one occasion had been in danger of surprise, and escaped by the swiftness of his horses. In the capital, as throughout Greece and the European part of the Empire, the triumph of

<sup>o</sup> Leo died June, 741. Gregory III. in the same year.

Artavasdus was followed by the restoration of the images. Anastasius, the dastard Patriarch of Constantinople, as he had been the slave of Leo, now became the slave of the usurper, and worshipped images with the same zeal with which he had destroyed them. He had been the principal actor in the deception of the people by the forged letters which announced the death of Constantine. He plunged with more desperate recklessness into the party of Artavasdus. The monks, and all over whom they had influence, took up the cause of the usurper; but the mass of the people, from loyal respect for the memory of Leo, or from their confidence in the vigorous character of Constantine and attachment to the legitimate succession, from indifference or aversion to image-worship, still wavered, and submitted, rather than clamorously rejoiced in the coronation of Artavasdus. The Patriarch came forward, seized the crucifix from the altar, and swore by the Crucified that Constantine had assured him that it was but folly to worship Jesus as the Son of God; that he was a mere man, that the Virgin Mother had borne him, but as his own mother Mary had borne himself. The furious people at once proclaimed the deposition of Constantine, no doubt to the great triumph of the image-worshippers. Besor, the renegade counsellor of Leo, to whom popular animosity attributed the chief part in the destruction of the images, fell in the first conflict.

But Constantine Copronymus with the religious opinions inherited the courage, the military abilities, and the popularity with the army which had distinguished his father Leo. After some vicissitudes, a battle took place near Ancyra, fought with all the ferocity of civil and religious war. The historian expresses his horror that, among Christians, fathers should thus be engaged in the slaughter of their children, brothers of brothers.<sup>4</sup> Constantine followed up his victory by the siege of the capital. After an obstinate resistance, and after having suffered all the horrors of famine, Constantinople was taken; Artavasdus escaped for a short time, but was soon captured, and brought in chains before the conqueror. An unsuccessful

<sup>4</sup> Theophanes *in loco*.

usurper risks his life on the hazard of his enterprise. It is difficult to decide whether the practice of blinding, instead of putting to death in such cases, was a concession to Christian humanity. The other common alternative of shutting up the rival for the throne in a monastery, and disqualifying him for empire by the tonsure, was not likely to occur to Constantine, nor would it have been safe, considering the general hatred of the monks to the emperor. Artavasdus was punished by the loss of his eyes; it was wanton cruelty afterwards to expose him, with his sons and principal adherents, during the races in the Hippodrome, to the contempt of the people.

Constantine was a soldier, doubtless of a fierce temper; the blinding and mutilation of many, the beheading a few of his enemies, the abandonment of the houses of the citizens to the plunder of his troops, was the natural course of Byzantine revolution; and these cruelties have no doubt lost nothing in the dark representations of the emperor's enemies, the only historians of the times. But they suffered as rebels in arms against their sovereign, not as image-worshippers. The fate of the Patriarch Anastasius was the most extraordinary. His eyes were put out, he was led upon an ass, with his face to the tail, through the city; and after all this mutilation and insult, for which, considering his tergiversation and impudent mendacity, it is difficult to feel much compassion; he was reinstated in the Patriarchal dignity. The clergy in the East had never been arrayed in the personal sanctity which, in ordinary occasions, they possessed in the West; but could Constantine have any other object in this act than the degradation of the whole order in public estimation? A.D. 743.

For ten years Constantine refrained from any stronger measures against image-worship. The overthrow of Artavasdus no doubt threw that large party of time-servers, the worshippers of the will of the emperor, on his side. His known severity of character would impress even his more fanatical opponents with awe; many images would vanish again, as it were, of their own accord; even the monks might observe some prudence in their resistance. During

these ten years Constantine had secured the frontiers of the Empire against the Saracens in the East, and the Bulgarians on the north; his throne had been strengthened by the birth of an heir. A dreadful pestilence, which, contrary to the usual course, travelled from west to east, spread from Calabria to Sicily, and throughout great part of the Empire. The popular mind, and even the government, must have been fully occupied by its ravages. The living, it is said, scarcely sufficed to bury the dead; the gardens within the city, and the vineyards without, were turned into a vast cemetery. The image-worshippers beheld in this visitation the vengeance of God against the Iconoclasts.\*

In the tenth year of Constantine rumours spread abroad of secret councils held for the total destruction of images. A.D. 746. Either the emperor must have prepared the public mind for this great change with consummate address, or reverence for images must have been less deeply rooted in the East than in the West, otherwise it can scarcely be supposed that so large a number of the clergy as appeared at the Third Council of Constantinople would have slavishly assented to the strong measures of the emperor.

Three hundred and forty-eight bishops formed this synod, which aspired to the dignity of the Seventh Third Council of Constantinople. Œcumenic Council. Its adversaries objected the absence of all the great Patriarchs, especially of the Pope, who was present neither in person nor by his delegates. The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were now cut off, as it were, from Christendom; they were the subjects of an unbelieving sovereign, perhaps could not, if they had been so disposed, obey the summons of the emperor. The Bishop of Rome was, if not in actual revolt, in contumacious opposition to him, who still claimed to be his sovereign. The Patriarch of Constantinople had lost all weight. The Bishop of Ephesus, occasionally the Bishop of Perga, presided in the council.

Part of the proceedings of this assembly have been pre-

\* διὰ τὴν ἀσθενεῖς γεννημένην εἰς τὰς ἐκλῆκας ἐπὶ τῶν κρητύτων κατὰ τὴν Θεοφάνη sub ann. 738, p. 651.

served in the records of the rival council, the second held at Nicea. The passages are cited in the original words, followed by a confutation, sanctioned apparently by the Nicene bishops. The confutation is in the tone of men assured of the sympathy of their audience. It deals far less in grave argument than in contemptuous crimination. The ordinary name for the Iconoclasts is the arraigners of Christianity.<sup>f</sup> It assumes boldly that the worship of images was the ancient, immemorial, unquestionable usage of the Church, recognised and practised by all the fathers, and sanctioned by the six General Councils: that the refusal to worship images is a new and rebellious heresy. Every quotation from the fathers which makes against images is rejected as a palpable forgery, so proved, as it is asserted, by its discordance with the universal tradition and practice of the Church.

But the Council of Constantinople had manifestly set the example of this peremptory and unargumentative dictation: it may be reasonably doubted whether it attempted a dispassionate and satisfactory answer to the better reasonings of the image-worshippers. It proscribes the lawless and blasphemous art of painting.<sup>g</sup> The fathers of Constantinople assume, as boldly as the brethren of Nicea their sanctity, that all images are the invention of the devil; that they are idols in the same sense as those of the heathen.<sup>h</sup> Nor do they hesitate to impute community of sentiment with the worst heretics to their opponents. They thought that they held the image-worshippers in an inextricable dilemma. If the painters represented only the humanity of Christ, they were Nestorians; if they attempted to mingle it with the Divinity, they were Eutychians, circumscribing the infinite, and confounding the two substances.<sup>i</sup> It was impiety to represent Christ with-

<sup>f</sup> *Χριστιανοκατήγοροι* is the term framed for the occasion.

<sup>g</sup> *ἐν ἀδίκῳ τῶν ζωγράφων τέχνῳ βλασφημῶσαν.*

<sup>h</sup> Faith they asserted came by *hearing*, and hearing from the Word of God.—P. 467.

<sup>i</sup> They made him *ἀδωρὸν*. The fathers of Nicea were indignant at the

barbarism of this word (p. 443). Their opponents might have retorted the use of the whimsical hybrid *φαλσέγγραφοι*. The most remarkable passage, as regards art, in this part of the controversy, is a description of a painting of the martyrdom of S. Eufemia, from the writings of Asterius, Bishop of Amasia. This picture, or rather series of pictures,

out his divinity, Arianism to undeify him, to despoil him of his godhead.

The Council of Nicea admits the perfect unanimity of the Council of Constantinople. These 348 bishops concurred in pronouncing their anathema against all who should represent the Incarnate Word by material form or colours, who should not restrict themselves to the pure spiritual conception of the Christ, as he is seated, superior in brightness to the sun, on the right hand of the Father; against all who should confound the two natures of Christ in one human image, or who should separate the manhood from the godhead in the Second Person of the indivisible Trinity; against all who should not implore the intercession of the Virgin in pure faith, as above all visible and invisible things<sup>k</sup>; against all who should set up the deaf and lifeless images of the saints, and who do not rather paint the living likenesses of their virtues in their own hearts. All images, whether statues or paintings, were to be forcibly removed from the churches; every one who henceforth should set up an image, if a bishop or priest, was to be degraded; if a layman, excommunicated. The one only image of the Redeemer, which might be lawfully worshipped, was in the Holy Sacrament; at the same time, therefore, that all images were to be removed, all respect was to be paid to the consecrated vessels of the Church.

Was, then, all this host of bishops, the concordant cry of whose anathema rose to heaven, according to the fathers of Nicea, like that of the guilty cities of the Old Testament, only subservient to the Imperial Will?<sup>m</sup> Or had a wide-spread repugnance to images grown up in the East? Were the clergy and the monks in hostile antagonism on this vital question? It appears evident, that

must have been of many figures, grouped with skill, and in the judgment of the bishop with wonderful expression; the various passions were blended with great felicity. Asterius compares it with the famous picture of Medea killing her children, which his language, somewhat vague indeed, might lead to the supposition that he had actually seen. The taste of Asterius may be somewhat

doubtful, since in one picture he describes the executioner drawing the teeth of the victim: the reality of the blood which flowed from her lips filled him with horror.—Labbe, p. 489.

<sup>k</sup> ὑπερίσταν τοὺς ἰσχυροὺς αἰῶνες ἡρώτων καὶ ἀσθενειῶν.

<sup>m</sup> ἡ κεκολλημένη αὐτῶν τοῦ διαβόλου ἐνδομινῶς καὶ γομφίωσιν πικρὰ λήθεται.—Labbe, p. 526.

the old ineradicable aversion to matter, the constant dread of entangling the Deity in this debasing bondage, which has been traced throughout all the Oriental controversies, lay at the bottom of much of this tergiversation. "We all subscribe, they declared at the close of their sitting, we are all of one mind, all of one orthodoxy, worshipping with the spirit the pure spiritual Godhead."<sup>a</sup> They concluded with their prayers for the pious emperor, who had given peace to the Church, who had extirpated idolatry, who had triumphed over those who taught that error, and settled for ever the true doctrine. They proceed to curse by name the principal asserters of image-worship. "Anathema against the double-minded Germanus, the worshipper of wood! Anathema against George (of Cyprus), the falsifier of the traditions of the fathers! Anathema against Mansar (they called by this unchristian-sounding name the famous John of Damascus), the Saracen in heart, the traitor to the Empire; Mansar the teacher of impiety, the false interpreter of Holy Scripture!"

<sup>a</sup> πάντες τοῖς τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ λατρίᾳ προσκυνούμεν.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## COUNCIL OF NICEA. CLOSE OF ICONOCLASM.

THUS was image-worship proscribed by a council, in numbers at least of weight, in the severest and most comprehensive terms. The work of demolition was committed to the imperial officers; only with strict injunctions, not perhaps always obeyed, to respect the vessels, the priestly vestments, and other furniture of the churches, and the cross, the naked cross without any image.\*

But if the emperor had overawed, or bought, or compelled the seemingly willing assent of so large a body of the eastern clergy, the formidable monks were still in obstinate implacable opposition to his will. The wretched Anastasius had died just before the opening of the council; and the emperor himself, it is said, ascended the pulpit, and proclaimed Constantine Bishop of Sylæum, œcumenic Patriarch, Bishop of Constantinople. Constantine had been a monk, and this appointment might be intended to propitiate that powerful interest, but Constantine, unlike his brethren, was an ardent Iconoclast.

The emperor was a soldier, and fierce wars with the Saracens and Bulgarians were not likely to soften a temper naturally severe and remorseless. He had committed his imperial authority in a deadly strife for the unattainable object of compelling his subjects to be purer and more spiritual worshippers of God than they were disposed to be; not suspecting that his own sanguinary persecutions were more unchristian than their superstitions. It was now fanaticism encountering fanaticism. Everywhere the monks preached resistance to the imperial decree, and enough has been seen of their turbulent and intractable conduct to make us conclude that their language at least

\* The crucifix was of a later period.—See Hist. of Christianity, iii. p. 515.

would keep no bounds. Stephen, the great martyr of this controversy, had lived as a hermit in a cave near Sinope for thirty years. The monks in great numbers had taken refuge in the desert, where they might watch in secret over their tutelary images; and not monks alone, but a vast multitude of the devout, crowded around the cell of Stephen to hear his denunciations against the breakers of images. The emperor ordered him to be carried away from his cell, the resort of so many dangerous pilgrims, and to be shut up in a cloister at Chrysopolis. The indignation of the monks was at its height. One named Andrew hastened from his dwelling in the desert, boldly confronted the emperor in the church of St. Mammias, and sternly addressed him—"If thou art a Christian, why do you treat Christians with such indignity?" The emperor so far commanded his temper, as simply to order his committal to prison; he afterwards summoned him again to his presence. The mildest term that the monk would use to address the emperor, was a second Valens, another Julian. Constantine's anger got the mastery; he commanded the monk to be scourged in the Hippodrome, and then to be strangled. The sisters of Andrew hardly saved his remains from being cast into the sea.<sup>b</sup>

For several years either the occupation of the emperor by foreign wars, or the greater prudence of the monks, enforced by this terrible example, suspended at least their more violent collisions with the authorities. Stephen <sup>The monk Stephen.</sup> still continued to preach in his cloister against the sin of the Iconoclasts.<sup>c</sup> The emperor sent the Patriarch to persuade him to subscribe the decrees of the Council of Constantinople. The Patriarch's eloquence was vain. The emperor either allowed or compelled the aged monk to retire to the wild rock of Proconnesus, where, to consummate his sanctity, he took his stand upon a pillar. His followers assembled in crowds about him, and built their cells around the pillar of the saint. But the zeal of Stephen would not be confined within that narrow sphere. He returned to the city, and in bold defiance of the im-

<sup>b</sup> Theophanes *in loc.*

<sup>c</sup> Acta S. Stephani, in *Analectis Græcis*, p. 396.

perial orders denounced the Iconoclasts. He was seized, cast into prison, and there treated with unusual harshness. But even there the zeal of his followers found access. Constantine exclaimed, in a paroxysm of careless anger, "Am I or this monk the emperor of the world?" The word of the emperor was enough for some of his obsequious courtiers; they rushed, broke open the prison, dragged out the old man along the streets, with every wanton cruelty, and cast his body at last into the common grave of the public malefactors.

The emperor took now a sterner and more desperate resolution. He determined to root out monkery itself. An old grievance was revived. The emperor and the people were enraged, or pretended to be enraged, that the monks decoyed the best soldiers from the army, especially one George Syncletus, and persuaded them to turn recluses.<sup>4</sup> The emperor compelled the patriarch not only to mount the pulpit and swear by the holy cross that he would never worship images, but immediately to break his monastic vows, to join the imperial banquet, to wear a festal garland, to eat meat, and to listen to the profane music of the harpers.

Then came a general ordinance, that the test of signing the articles of Constantinople should be enforced on all the clergy, and all the more distinguished monks.\* On their refusal the monks were driven from their cloisters, which were given up to profane and secular uses. Consecrated virgins were forced to marry; monks were compelled, each holding the hand of a woman, doubtless not of the purest character, to walk round the Hippodrome among the jeers and insults of the populace. Throughout the empire they were exposed to the lawless persecutions of the imperial officers. Their zeal or their obstinacy was chastised by scourgings, imprisonments, mutilations, and even death. The monasteries were plundered, and by no scrupulous or reverent hands; churches are said to have been despoiled of all their sacred treasures, the holy books

<sup>4</sup> This, according to the martyrologist of Stephen, was a trick of the Emperor, with whom George had a secret understanding, to bring odium on the monks.

\* *ἐγένετο συνδικὸν αὐτὰ καλῶς ὁ ἀρεβί-  
τατος, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοποις ἐν παντί, καὶ τῶν  
μοναζόντων τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐν' αἵσι, ταῦτα  
ὑποσημαίνεσθαι.*—Compare Concil. Nic. ii.  
p. 510.

burned, feasts and revels profaned the most hallowed sanctuaries. Multitudes fled to the neighbouring kingdoms of the less merciless Barbarians ; many found refuge in the West, especially in Rome. The Prefect of Thrace was the most obsequious agent of his master's tyranny. Throughout that Theme the monks were forced to abandon their vows of solitude and celibacy under pain of being blinded and sent into exile. Monasteries, with all their estates and property, were confiscated. Relics as well as images, in some cases no doubt books,<sup>f</sup> and the whole property of the convents was pillaged or burned by the ignorant soldiery. The personal cruelties against the monks will not bear description ; the prefect is said not to have left one in the whole Theme who ventured to wear the monastic habit.

In Constantinople a real or suspected conspiracy against the emperor involved some of the noblest patricians, and some who filled the highest offices of state, in the same persecution. Eight or nine of the more distinguished were dragged, amid the shouts of the rabble, round the hippodrome, and then put to death. The fate of two brothers, named Constantine, moved general commiseration. The prefect was scourged and deposed for not having suppressed these signs of public sympathy. Others were blinded, cruelly scourged, and sent into exile.<sup>g</sup> The patriarch himself was accused of having used disrespectful language towards the emperor. Already he had been required to acquit himself of imputing Nestorianism to his master ; now his accusers swore on the cross that they had heard him hold conference with one of the conspirators. Constantine ordered the imperial seal to be affixed on the palace of the patriarch, and sent him into banishment.

But this miserable slave of the imperial will was not allowed to shroud himself in obscure retirement. He had consented to the consecration of Nicetas, an eunuch of Slavonian descent, in his place. For some new offence, real or supposed, the exiled patriarch was brought back to

<sup>f</sup> Some books were burned as containing pictures. One is mentioned in a statement made to the Council of Nicea: *ἀγιογραφὰς πικρὰς ἔχου, καὶ ἐκτεταγμένους τοῖς οὐνοῖς καὶ τῇ γῇ ἀγίων κειμήλια*—Pictures illuminated on a silver ground?—

Conc. Nic., p. 373.

<sup>g</sup> Theophanes, compared with statement before the Nicene Council.

the capital, scourged so cruelly that he could not walk, and then carried in a litter, and exposed in the great church before all the people assembled to hear the public recital of the charges made against him, and to behold his degradation. At each charge the secretary of his successor smote him on the face. He was then set up in the pulpit, and while Nicetas read the sentence of excommunication, another bishop stripped him of his metropolitan pall, and calling him by the opprobrious name Scotiopsis, face of darkness, led him backwards out of the church. The next day his head, beard, eyebrows, were shaved; in a short and sleeveless dress he was put upon an ass, and paraded through the circus (his own nephew, a hideous, deformed youth, leading the ass) while the populace jeered, shouted, spat upon him. He was then thrown down, trodden on, and in that state lay till the games were over. Some days after the emperor sent to demand a formal declaration of the orthodoxy of his own faith, and of the authority of the council. The poor wretch acknowledged both in the amplest manner; as a reward he was beheaded, while still in a state of excommunication, and his remains treated with the utmost ignominy. The historian adds, as an aggravation of the emperor's ferocity, that the patriarch had baptized two of his children.<sup>h</sup>

This odious scene, blackened it may be by the sectarian hatred of the later annalists, all of whom abhorred Iconoclasm, has been related at length in order to contrast more fully the position of the Bishop of Rome. This was the second patriarch of Constantinople who had been thus barbarously treated, and seemingly without the sympathy of the people; and now, in violation of all canonical discipline, the imperial will had raised an eunuch to the patriarchate. What wonder that pontiffs like Gregory II. and Gregory III. should think themselves justified in throwing off the yoke of such a government, and look with hope to the sovereignty of the less barbarous Barbarians of the North—Barbarians who, at least, had more reverence for the dignity of the sacerdotal character.

<sup>h</sup> Theophanes, p. 681.

If the Byzantine historians, all image-worshippers, have not greatly exaggerated the cruelties of their implacable enemy Constantine Copronymus, they have assuredly not done justice to his nobler qualities, his valour, incessant activity, military skill, and general administration of the sinking empire, which he maintained unviolated by any of its formidable enemies, and with imposing armies, during a reign of thirty-five years, not including the twenty preceding during which he ruled as the colleague of his father Leo. Constantine died, during a campaign against the Bulgarians, of a fever which, in the charitable judgment of his adversaries, gave him a foretaste of the pains of hell. His dying lips ordered prayers and hymns to be offered to the Virgin, for whom he had always professed the most profound veneration, utterly inconsistent, his enemies supposed, with his hostility to her sacred images.

Character  
and death of  
Constantine  
Copronymus.

A.D. 775.

A female had been the principal mover in the great change of Christianity from a purely spiritual worship to that paganizing form of religion which grew up with such rapidity in the succeeding centuries; a female was the restorer of images in the East, which have since, with but slight interruption, maintained their sanctity. The first, Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, was a blameless and devout woman, who used the legitimate influence of her station, munificence, and authority over her imperial son, to give that splendour, which to her piety appeared becoming, to the new religion; to communicate to the world all those excitements of symbols, relics, and sacred memorials which she found so powerful in kindling her own devotion. The second, the Empress Irene, wife to the son and heir of Constantine Copronymus, an ambitious, intriguing, haughty princess, never lost sight of political power in the height of her religious zeal, and was at length guilty of the most atrocious crime against God and womanhood.<sup>1</sup>

Helena and  
Irene.

Irene, during the reign of her husband Leo, surnamed the Chazar, did not openly betray her inclination to the

<sup>1</sup> The Pope Hadrian anticipated a new Constantine and a new Helena in Irene and her son.—Hadrian, *Epist. apud Labbe*, p. 102.

image-worship which she had solemnly forsworn under her father-in-law Constantine. Leo was a man of feeble constitution and gentle mind, controlled by the strongest influences of religion. He endeavoured to allay the heat of the conflicting parties. His first acts gave some hopes to the image-worshippers that he was favourably disposed to the Mother of God and to the monks (these interests the monks represented as inseparable); he appointed some metropolitans from the abbots of monasteries.\*

This short reign of Leo IV. is remarkable for the attempt of the emperor to re-introduce a more popular element into the public administration—a kind of representative assembly;—and the general voice, in gratitude to Leo, demanded the elevation of his infant son to the rank of Augustus. The prophetic heart of the parent foresaw the danger. He was conscious of his own feeble health; to leave an unprotected infant on the throne was (according to all late precedent in the Byzantine empire) to doom him to death. Leo assembled not the senate and nobles alone, the chief officers of the army and of the court, but likewise the people of Constantinople. He explained the cause of his hesitation, confessed his fears, and demanded and received a solemn oath upon the cross, that on his death they would acknowledge no other emperor but his son. The next day he proclaimed his son Augustus: the signatures of the whole people to their oath were received and deposited, amid loud acclamations that they would lay down their lives for the emperor, on the table of the Holy Communion.

A few months matured a conspiracy. Nicephorus, the emperor's brother, was designed for the throne. But again the emperor, instead of putting forth the strong and revengeful arm of despotism, appealed to the people. In a full assembly he produced the proofs of the conspiracy, and left the cause to the popular judgment. The general voice declared the conspirators guilty

\* Ὅραξιν ἐνισβῆς εἶναι πρὸς ἄλγιον χρόνον, καὶ φίλος τῆς θεοτόκου καὶ τῶν μοναχῶν. Theophan., p. 695.

of a capital crime, and renewed their vows of fidelity to the infant emperor. But the gentle Leo spared his brother; some few of the conspirators were put to death, others incapacitated for future mischief by the tonsure;—thus the greatest honour, that of the priesthood, had become a punishment for crime! The moderation of Leo induced him to appoint as Patriarch of Constantinople, Paul, a Cypriot by birth, as yet of no higher rank than a reader; a man willing to shrink and keep aloof from the controversy of the day. Leo was ill rewarded. The monkish party, watching no doubt his declining health, and knowing the secret sentiments of the empress, introduced some small images, in direct violation of the law, into the palace, and even into her private chamber. Some deeper real or suspected cause of apprehension must have existed in the mind of the emperor to make him depart from his wonted leniency. Many of the principal officers were seized and cast into prison, where one of them died, in the following reign held to be a martyr, the rest became distinguished monks. But from that time so strong was the hatred of the image-worshippers, that Leo was branded as a cruel persecutor; his death was attributed to an act of sacrilege. He was a great admirer of precious stones, and took away and wore a crown, the offering of the Emperor Heraclius to some church. The fatal circle burned into his head, which broke out into carbuncles of which he died. There was Death of Leo.  
A.D. 780. no need to invent this fable to account for the death of one so infirm as Leo; still less to suggest suspicions, on the other side, that his death was caused by poison.

Irene at once seized the government in the name of her son Constantine, who was but ten years old. An attempt was made on the part of Nicephorus, the Irene  
Empress. rebel brother of Leo, to supplant the empress in the regency and in the tutelage of her son. It was suppressed; the chiefs of the faction punished by the scourge and exile, the brothers of the late emperor compelled to undergo ordination and to administer the Eucharist as a public sign of their incapacitation for secular business.

The crafty Irene dissembled for a time her design for

the restoration of images. Her ambitious mind (it is not uncommon in her sex) was deeply tinged by superstition; no doubt she thought that she secured the divine blessing, or rather that of the Virgin and the saints, upon her schemes of power, by the honour which she was preparing for their images. Fanaticism and policy took counsel together within her heart. But the clergy of Constantinople were too absolutely committed, as yet, on the other side; the army revered the memory, perhaps chiefly on that account the opinions, of Constantine Copronymus. The Patriarch, an aged and peaceful man, who had sincerely wished to escape the perilous charge of the episcopate, was neither disposed nor fitted to lend himself as an active instrument in such an enterprise. He was not absolutely indisposed to the image-worshippers; and when the empress allowed the laws to fall into disuse, and connived at the quiet restoration of some images, and encouraged the monks with signs of favour, it was bruited abroad that she acted in no discordance with the bishop's secret opinion. The public mind was duly prepared by prodigies in the remoter parts of the Empire for the coming revolution.

On a sudden the Patriarch Paul disappeared. It was proclaimed that he had renounced his dignity, retreated into a cloister, and taken the habit of a monk. It cannot be known whether he had any secret understanding with the empress, but he who had been so solemnly and publicly pledged to the former emperor against the images, would hardly, an old and unambitious man, take a strong part in their restoration. The empress visited his cloister and inquired the cause of his sudden retirement. From the first, said the lowly patriarch, his mind had been ill at ease; that he had accepted a see rejected from the communion of great part of Christendom; should he die in this state of excommunication he would inevitably go to hell.<sup>m</sup> The empress sent the chief persons of the court to hear this confession from the

A.D. 783.  
Tarasius  
Patriarch:

<sup>m</sup> The Empress states this in the imperial letter read at the opening of the Council of Nicea:—τὸ ἀνάθημα ἔγω ἀπὸ

πατρὸς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὃ ἀπάρημι εἰς τὸ σκοτὸς τὸ ἑλώτιον. τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῇ διαβόλῃ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγελοῖς αὐτοῦ.—P. 52.

lips of the repentant patriarch. Paul deplored with bitter sorrow that he had concurred in the decrees against images; his mind was now awakened to truth; and he suggested, no doubt the suggestions of others, that nothing could heal the wounds of the afflicted Church but a general council to decide on image-worship. Having made this humiliating declaration he expired in peace.

On the succession to the see of Constantinople might depend the worship or the rejection of images throughout the East. Among all the clergy <sup>A.D. 784.</sup> Irene could find no one of influence, ability, and resolution equal to cope with the approaching crisis. The appointment of a monk would probably have been the signal for the rallying of the adverse party. Among her privy counsellors<sup>n</sup> was a man who in the world bore the character of profound religion, and of whose ability and ambition Irene had formed a high, and, as events proved, a just estimate. The empress assembled the people; she declared her respect for the memory of Paul; she asserted that she would not have allowed him to abandon his higher duties for monastic seclusion, but God had now withdrawn him from the scene, and it was necessary to appoint a successor of known capacity and holiness. The affair had been well organised; a general acclamation demanded Tarasius; to the demand the empress assented with undisguised satisfaction. Tarasius gave a good omen of his future conduct by the address with which he seemed to decline the arduous honour, on account of the controversies which distracted the Church. In a well-acted scene the empress employed persuasion, influence, authority, to win the reluctant patriarch. Tarasius played admirably the part of humble refusal, of concession, of capitulation on his own terms. The condition of his acceptance was the summoning a council to decide the great question of image-worship, which he declared to have been decreed by the sole authority of the emperor Leo, and to that authority the Council of Constantinople had only yielded its assent. Most of the people gave, at least seemingly, their cordial concurrence in the election, though even the admirers of Tarasius

\* *αρεσκεις*—the Grecised Latinism.

admit that there was much secret murmuring, and some open clamour among the lower populace.

Tarasius immediately took measures to consolidate the whole strength of the party. Messengers were sent to Rome to obtain the presence of the pope (Hadrian) in person or by his legates. Hadrian made some show of remonstrance against the sudden promotion of a layman to so important a see, but acquiesced in it, as demanded by the emergencies of the times. The patriarchs of Alexandria and of Antioch and of Jerusalem were summoned, and certain ecclesiastics appeared as representatives of those prelates.

The Council met in Constantinople; but with the army and a large part of the populace of Constantinople image-worship had lost its power. The soldiery, attached to the memory and tenets of Constantine Copronymus, broke into the assembly, and dispersed the affrighted monks and bishops. The empress in vain exerted herself to maintain order. No one was hurt; but it was manifest that no council of image-worshippers was safe in the capital.

Nicea was chosen for the session of the council, no doubt on account of the reverence which attached to that city, hallowed by the sittings of the first great council of Christendom. Decrees issued from Nicea would possess peculiar force and authority; this smaller city, too, could be occupied by troops, on whom the empress could depend, and in the mean time Irene managed to disband the more unruly soldiery. Thus, while the Bulgarians menaced one frontier and the Saracens another, she sacrificed the safety of the Empire, by the dissolution of her best army, to the success of her religious designs.

The council met at Nicea. The number of ecclesiastics is variously stated from 330 to 387. Among these were at least 130 monks or abbots, besides many bishops, who had been expelled as monks from their sees, and were now restored. Tarasius took the lead as virtual, if not acknowledged, president of the assembly. The first act of the Council of Nicea showed the degree of dispassionate fairness with which the inquiry was about to be conducted.

A.D. 785.

Second council of Nicea.

A.D. 787.

After the imperial letters of convocation had been read, three bishops appeared, Basilius of Ancyra, Theodosius of Myra in Lycia, Theodosius of Amorrium; they humbly entreated permission to recant their errors, to be reconciled to the Catholic Church. They recited a creed framed with great care, and no doubt of pre-arranged orthodoxy, in which they repudiated the so-called Council of Constantinople, as a synod of fools and madmen, who had dared to violate the established discipline of the Church, and impiously reviled the holy images. 'They showered their anathemas on all the acts, on all the words, on all the persons engaged in that unhallowed assembly.'

The council received this humble confession of their sin and misery with undisguised joy; and Tarasius pronounced the solemn absolution. Certain other prelates were then admitted, among them the Bishops of Nicea and Rhodes. They were received after more strict examination, and citation of ecclesiastical precedents, from which it appeared that bishops who recanted Arianism and Nestorianism, having been re-admitted into the Church, even Iconoclasts should not be rejected from her bosom on the same terms.<sup>p</sup> The severer monks made vigorous resistance to these acts of lenity, but were overruled at length. It was debated to what class of heretics the Iconoclasts were to be ascribed. The patriarch proposed only to confound them with the most odious of all the Manicheans and the Montanists.<sup>q</sup> The inexorable leader of the monkish party asserted that it was worse than the worst heresy, being absolute renegation of Christ.<sup>r</sup> This was among the preliminary acts of a council, assembled to deliberate, examine, discuss, and then decide this profound theological question.

<sup>o</sup> They denounced the prelates who presided in the assembly; among the rest Basil of Pisidia, on whom they inflicted an ecclesiastical nickname. He was fitly named (*κακισμῆτος*) *τριπύκκαβος*, or *τρίκαβος*.

<sup>p</sup> It is worthy of remark that they accuse the Council of Constantinople of asserting the sole authority of Scripture, the insufficiency of Tradition without it: *ὡς εἰ μὴ ἐκ τῆς σκευῆς καὶ κεινῆς διδασκαλίας*

*ἀσφαλῶς διδασκῶμεν, ἐν ἱερίᾳ ταῖς διδασκαλίαις τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων.* They brand this doctrine as that of Arius, Nestorius, and other heretics.

<sup>q</sup> The usual difficulty arose as to ordinations conferred or received by such heterodox bishops.

<sup>r</sup> *ἢ αἰεὶς αὐτῇ χεὶρ πάντων τῶν ἀρίστων κακόν' ἐκείναις τοῖς ἁποστατοῦσι, καὶ (κακῶν κακίστη) ὡς τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀνατρέπονται.*—P. 78.

The whole proceedings of the council, though conducted with orderly gravity, are marked with the same pre-determinate character, the same haughty and condemnatory tone towards the adversaries of image-worship. The fathers of Nicea impaired a doubtful cause by the monstrous fables which they adduced, the preposterous arguments which they used, their unmeasured invectives against their antagonists. The Pope Hadrian, in his public letter, related a wild and recent legend of a vision of Constantine the Great, in which St. Paul and St. Peter appeared to him, and whom he knew to be the apostles by their resemblance to pictures of them, exhibited to him by Pope Sylvester.\* It is the standing argument against the Iconoclasts: "the Jews and Samaritans reject images, therefore, all who reject them are as Jews and Samaritans."<sup>†</sup> The ordinary appellations of the Iconoclast comprehend every black shade of heresy, impiety, atheism.

The rapidity with which the council executed its work was facilitated by the unanimity of its decisions.<sup>‡</sup> The whole assembly of bishops and monks subscribed the creed, in which, after assenting to the decrees of the first six councils, and to the anathemas against the heretics denounced therein, they passed, acting, as they declared, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the following canon.

"With the venerable and life-giving cross shall be set  
Decree on image-worship. up the venerable and holy images, whether in colours, in mosaic work, or any other material, within the consecrated churches of God, on the sacred vessels and vestments, on the walls and on tablets, on houses and in highways. The images, that is to say, of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ; of the immaculate Mother of God; of the honoured angels; of all saints and holy men. These images shall be treated as holy memorials, worshipped, kissed, only without that peculiar adoration<sup>\*</sup> which is reserved for the Invisible, Incomprehensible God."

\* Labbe, Concil., p. 111.

† Ib., p. 358.

‡ There were eight sittings between the

24th Sept. and 23rd Oct.—Walch, p. 560.

\* We have no word to distinguish between προσκύνησις and λατρεία.

All who shall violate this, as is asserted, immemorial tradition of the Church, and endeavour, forcibly or by craft, to remove any image, if ecclesiastics, are to be deposed and excommunicated, if monks or laymen, excommunicated.

The council was not content with this formal and solemn subscription. With one voice they broke out into a long acclamation, "We all believe, we all assent, we all subscribe. This is the faith of the apostles, this is the faith of the Church, this is the faith of the orthodox, this is the faith of all the world. We, who adore the Trinity, worship images. Whoever does not the like, anathema upon him! Anathema on all who call images idols! Anathema on all who communicate with them who do not worship images! Anathema upon Theodorus, falsely called Bishop of Ephesus; against Sisinnius of Perga, against Basilius with the ill-omened name! Anathema against the new Arius Nestorius and Dioscorus, Anastasius; against Constantine and Nicetas! (the Iconoclast Patriarchs of Constantinople). Everlasting glory to the orthodox Germanus, to John of Damascus! To Gregory of Rome everlasting glory! Everlasting glory to the preachers of truth!"

Our history pauses to inquire what incidental notices of the objects and the state of Christian art transpire during this controversy, more especially in the proceedings of the Council of Nicea. There seem to have been four kinds of images against which the hostility of their adversaries was directed, and which were defended by the resolute attachment of their worshippers. I. Images, properly so called, which were thrown from their pedestals, and broken in pieces. II. Mosaic paintings, which were picked out. III. Paintings on waxen tablets on the walls, which were smoked and effaced. IV. Paintings on wood, which were burned. There were likewise carvings on the sacred vessels; and books were destroyed on account of the pictures with which they were embellished.<sup>7</sup>

In all the images and paintings there was, as formerly observed, a reverential repugnance to attempt

<sup>7</sup> Passim, especially address to the Emperor at the close of the Council.—P. 580.

any representation of God the Father. The impiety of this was universally admitted; the image-worshippers protest against it in apparent sincerity, and not as exculpating themselves from any such charge by their adversaries.

The first and most sacred object of art was the Saviour, and next to the Saviour the "Mother of God." The propriety of substituting the actual human form of the Saviour for the symbolic Lamb,<sup>a</sup> or the Good Shepherd, was now publicly and authoritatively asserted. Among the images of various forms and materials some are mentioned of silver and of gold. A certain Philastrius objected to the Holy Ghost being figured in the form of a dove.<sup>a</sup>

A question of the form under which angels and arch-angels should be represented could not but arise. The fitness of the human form was unhesitatingly asserted; and angels were declared to have a certain corporeity, more thin and impalpable than the grosser body of man, but still not absolute spirit. Severus objected to angels in purple robes: they should be white, no doubt as representing light.<sup>b</sup>

The whole of the New Testament is said to have been represented; meaning, no doubt, all the main facts of the history.<sup>c</sup> Among the subjects in the Old Testament, as early as Gregory of Nyssa, a picture is described of the sacrifice of Isaac, in which there must have been an attempt at least at strong expression.<sup>d</sup> Chrysostom is cited for a picture on the sublime but difficult subject of the angel destroying the army of Sennacherib. Images of Moses, of Elijah, of Isaiah, and of Zechariah, are named. Pope Hadrian asserts (but there has been already ground to question his assertion), that Constantine built a church in Rome, in which was painted on one side Adam expelled from paradise, on the other, the penitent thief ascending into it. In Alexandria there was an early painting of the Saviour between the Virgin and John the Baptist.

<sup>a</sup> P. 123. See curious extract from the Journeying of the Twelve Apostles; a Docetic book, and so ruled to be by the Council.

<sup>b</sup> P. 370.

<sup>c</sup> P. 358.

<sup>b</sup> P. 373.

<sup>d</sup> P. 203.

There is nothing, or hardly anything, to induce the supposition that any one image or painting was distinguished as a work of art; as impressing the minds of its worshippers with admiration of its peculiar grace, majesty, or resemblance to actual life. Art, as art, entered not into the controversy. It was the religious feeling which gave its power to the image or painting, not the happy design, or noble execution, which awakened or deepened the religious feeling. The only exception to this is the description of the picture representing the martyrdom of St. Euphemta, by Asterius Bishop of Amasia. This was painted on linen.\*

Among the acclamations and the anathemas which closed the Second Council of Nicea, echoed loud salutations and prayers for the peace and blessedness of the new Constantine and the new Helena. A few years passed, and that Constantine was blinded, if not put to death, by his unnatural mother, whom religious faction had raised into a model of Christian virtue and devotion.

A long struggle took place, when Constantine reached the age of manhood, between the mother, eager to retain her power, and the son, to assume his rightful authority. All the common arts of intrigue and party manœuvre were exhausted before they came to open hostilities. The principal courtiers, and part of the army, ranged themselves in opposite factions. Irene, anticipating, it was said, her adversaries, struck the first blow, seized, scourged, shaved into ecclesiastics, and imprisoned the chief of her son's adherents. A considerable part of the troops swore solemnly that the son should not reign during the lifetime of Irene; the son was given over to her absolute power, and chastised like a refractory school-boy. The next year a division of the army revolted, and proclaimed Constantine sole Emperor. The usual fate of the scourge and the tonsure befel the leaders of Irene's faction. The Empress was confined to her palace. But her inexhaustible fertility in intrigue soon restored her power. Constantine, having suffered a shameful defeat by the Bulgarians, through her advice wreaked his vengeance

\* *in situ.*

on his uncles, whom he accused of aspiring to the throne ; they were blinded, or mutilated by the loss of their tongues. Five years afterwards, on the very same day of the month (a less superstitious age might have beheld in this coincidence the retributive hand of God), Constantine was blinded by his mother.

These five years were years of base intrigue, treachery, outward courtesy and even the familiar intercourse of close kindred, of inward hatred, jealousy, and attempts to mine and countermine each the interest of the other. It was attributed to his mother's advice, with the design of heightening his unpopularity, that Constantine divorced himself from his wife Maria, forced her to retire into a convent, and married a woman of her bedchamber, named Theodota. The rigid monks were furious at the weakness of the Patriarch Tarasius, who had sanctioned the reception of the divorced empress in a monastery. Plato, the most intolerant, and therefore most distinguished of them, withdrew from communion with the Patriarch. The indignant Emperor imprisoned some, and banished others of the more refractory monks to Thessalonica. This at once threw the whole powerful monastic faction into the interests of the Empress, who openly espoused their cause. The Armenian Guards, who had now assumed something like the power, insolence, and versatility of the old Prætorian troops, were alienated by the severity of Constantine. Irene wound her toils with consummate skill around her ill-fated victim. There was treachery in his army, in his court, in his palace. He was bitterly afflicted by the loss of his eldest son. At length the plot was ripe ; he knew it, and attempted in vain to make his escape to the East. Either fearing, or pretending to fear, lest he should regain his liberty, Irene sent to her secret emissaries around his person, and threatened to betray their treachery if they did not deliver up their master to her hands. Constantine was seized on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, conducted to the porphyry chamber, in which Irene had borne him—her first-born son. In that very chamber the crime was perpetrated.<sup>f</sup> His eyes were put

Murder of  
Constantine.

<sup>f</sup> διωξὺς καὶ ἀνίσταται πρὸς τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὸν.—Theophan., p. 732.

out, so cruelly and so incurably, as to threaten his death. In the East, the conduct of the unnatural mother was seen with unmitigated horror. An eclipse <sup>A.D. 797.</sup> of the sun, accompanied with such darkness, that ships wandered from their courses, was held to be a sign of the sympathy of the heavenly orbs with the suffering Emperor—an expression of divine disapprobation. Among the few instances in the annals of mankind, in which ambition and the love of sway have quenched the maternal feeling—that strongest and purest impulse of human nature—is the crime committed against her son by the Empress Irene. But it is even more awful and humiliating that religious passions should be so inextinguishable, that a churchman of profound learning, of unimpeachable character, should, many centuries after, be so bewildered by zeal for the *orthodox* Empress, as to palliate, extenuate, as far as possible apologise, for this appalling deed, in which the sounder moral sense of the old Grecian tragedy would have imagined a divine Nemesis for the accumulated guilt of generations of impious ancestors.<sup>5</sup>

So completely indeed might the Iconoclastic faction appear to be crushed, that neither during the strife between the mother and the son, though it might have some latent influence, did it give any manifest or threatening sign of its existence; and Irene reigned in peace for five years, and was overthrown by a revolution, in which <sup>A.D. 797-802.</sup> religion had no apparent concern.

<sup>5</sup> The passage must be quoted:—“*Scelus planè execrandum, nisi quod multi excusant, justitiæ eam zelus ad id faciendum excitasset, quo nomine eadem post hæc meruit commendari. At non fuit matris jussio, ut ista pateretur, sed ut teneretur,*” (this is directly contrary to Theophanes and the best authorities,) “*nec amplius imperaret, tanquam si e manu furiosi gladium auferret. Docuit Christus verbis suis summæ pietatis genus esse in hoc adversus filium esse crudelem, ipso dicente.*” (The Cardinal here cites our Lord’s words, Matt. x. 37, “He that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.”) “*Quum jam olim, Dei præcepto, justæ sint armatæ manus paren-*

*tum in filios, abeuntes post Deos alienos, illisque necatis, qui hoc fecerint, Moysis ore laudati, ita dicentis, Exod. xxxii. 29. Plurimum interest quo quis aliquid animo agat. Si enim regnandi cupidine Irene in filium molita esset insidias, detestabilior Agrippina matre Neronis fuisset. . . Contra vero quod ista, religionis causâ, amore justitiæ in filium perpetrata credantur, ab Orientalibus nonnullis, qui facto aderant, viris sanctissimis! eadem posthæc præconio meruit celebrari.*” As if any motive could be assigned but the most unscrupulous ambition; though doubtless she was throughout supported by the image-worshippers.—Baron. Ann. sub ann. dccxcvii.

The controversy slept during the reign of Nicephorus, and that of Michael, surnamed Rhangabes. The monks throughout this period seem to form an independent power (a power no doubt arising out of, and maintained by, their championship of image-worship), and to dictate to the Emperor, and even to the Church. On the other hand, among the soldiery are heard some deep but suppressed murmurs of attachment to the memory of Constantine Copronymus.

Leo the Armenian. Michael Rhangabes felt and acknowledged his incapacity. The weak Michael had courted the friendship of the monks; on his invitation, or with his acquiescence, they settled in increasing swarms within the city. The Armenian was another of those rude soldiers, born in a less civilised part of Christendom, in which image-worship had not taken profound root. But he did not betray his repugnance to the popular religious feeling until, like his predecessor the Isaurian Leo, he had secured the north-western and eastern frontiers of the empire. Against the Bulgarians, who were actually besieging Constantinople, he began the war by a base act of treachery, an attempt to assassinate Cromnus, their victorious king, during a peaceful interview; he terminated it by a splendid victory, which for a time crushed the power of these Barbarians. He was equally successful against the Saracens. The firm and prosperous administration of Leo extorted from the exiled Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicephorus, an ample if unwilling acknowledgment. "Impious as he was, he was a wise guardian of the public interests. Firm in civil as in military affairs, superior to wealth, he chose his ministers for their worth, not their riches, and aimed at least at the rigid execution of justice."<sup>b</sup>

But all these virtues were obscured, in the sight of the image-worshippers, by his attempt to suppress that worship. Even on his accession there was some mistrust of his opinions; the name Chameleon can scarcely apply to anything but his suspected religious versatility. The

<sup>b</sup> Theophan. Contin., p. 30.

Patriarch at that time tendered him a profession of faith, which he adroitly put by till he should have despatched the more pressing duties of his station. He seemed, however, as he passed the brazen gate, to do homage to an image of the Saviour placed above it.

The enemies of Leo attribute his change to the artifices of a monk, by some strange contradiction a hater of images. The superstitious Leo was addicted to the consultation of self-asserted diviners; he had been designated by this monk, endowed as was supposed with the prophetic gift, for the throne. As the witch of Endor Saul, so the monk had recognised the future monarch, though shrouded in disguise. At the same time, he was threatened with immediate death if he did not follow the course of Leo the Isaurian; if he did, the empire was to remain in his family for generations.

The emperor summoned the Patriarch Nicephorus to his presence before the senate, and proposed the insidious question, whether there were not those <sup>Against image-worship.</sup> who denied the lawfulness of worship to images? The Patriarch was not scrupulous in his reply. He appealed to the holy Veronica, the napkin with the impression of the Saviour's face, the first sacred image not made with hands. He declared that there were images made by the apostles themselves, of the Saviour and the Mother of God; that there was actually in Rome a picture of the transfiguration, painted by the order of St. Peter; he did not forget the statue at Paneas, in Palestine.<sup>1</sup> Another bishop boldly admonished the emperor to attend to his proper business, the army, and not to venture to meddle with the affairs of the Church, in which he had no concern. The indignant emperor banished the two intractable prelates. Euthymius, of Sardis, who had used still more opprobrious language, was corporally punished with blows and stripes. As Irene had promoted Tarasius, so Leo raised an officer of his household, Theodotus Cassiteras, to the patriarchal throne. Image-worship was again proscribed by an imperial edict. The worshippers are said to

<sup>1</sup> Symeon Magister in Theoph. Contin., p. 607.

have been ruthlessly persecuted ; and Leo, according to the phraseology of the day, is accused of showing all the blood-thirstiness, without the generosity, of the lion. Yet no violent popular tumult took place ; nor does the conspiracy which afterwards cut short the days of Leo the Armenian appear to have been connected with the strife of religious factions. He might have escaped his fate but for his scrupulous reverence for the institutions of the Church. Michael the Stammerer had risen, like Leo, to military distinction. He was guilty, or at least suspected, of traitorous designs against the emperor, thrown into prison, and condemned to immediate death. But the next day (the day appointed for his execution) was the feast of the nativity of Christ. The wife of Leo urged him not to profane that sacred season, that season of peace and good-will, by a public execution. Leo, with a sad prophetic spirit, answered that she and her children would bitterly rue the delay ; but he could not withstand her scruples and his own. Yet his mind misgave him : at midnight the emperor stole into the dungeon, to assure himself that all was safe. The prisoner was sleeping quietly ; but a slave, who had hid himself under the bed, recognised the purple sandals of the emperor. Michael instantly sent word to the other conspirators, that unless they struck the blow he would denounce them as his accomplices. The chamberlain of Leo was Michael's kinsman ; and on the dawn of the holy day, which Leo had feared to violate, the conspirators mingled with the clergy, who assembled as usual, at the third watch, to hail the birth of Christ. The emperor was famed for the finest voice in the city : he had joined in the beautiful hymn of peace, when the conspirators rushed to the attack. At first, in the fog of the morning, they mistook the leader of the clergy for the emperor, but

Murder of Leo. fortunately he took off his cap and showed his tonsure. Leo, in the meantime, had taken refuge at the altar, seized the great cross, and with this unseemly weapon, grasped in his despair, kept his enemies at bay, till at length a gigantic soldier lifted his sword to strike. Leo reminded him of his oath of allegiance : "Tis no time to speak of oaths," replied the soldier, "but

of death ;" and swearing by the divine grace,<sup>k</sup> smote off the arm of his sovereign, which fell with the heavy cross ; another struck off his head. Michael was crowned with the fetters of his captivity still on his legs.

Whatever hopes the clergy, at least the image-worshippers, or the monks, might have conceived at the murder of Leo, which they scrupled not to allege as a sign of the divine disfavour towards the Iconoclasts, were disappointed on the accession of Michael the Stammerer. The new emperor was a soldier more rude than the last ; he could scarcely read. His birth was ascribed to a Phrygian village, chiefly inhabited by Jews ; and he was said to have been educated in a strange creed, which was neither Judaism nor Christianity. He affected a coarse humour ; he did not spare the archbishop, who returned without authority, but without rebuke, from his exile, and forced an interview with the emperor. Michael received and dismissed him with civil scorn. Rumours were circulated, that even on more sacred subjects he did not repress his impious sarcasms. His whole conduct seemed tinged with a kind of Sadducising Judaism. He favoured the Jews in the exaction of tribute (perhaps he was guilty of the sin of treating them with justice), he fasted on the Jewish Sabbath, he doubted the resurrection of the dead, and the personality of the devil, as unauthorised by the religion of Moses.<sup>m</sup> Image-worship he treated with contemptuous impartiality. He declared that he knew nothing of these ecclesiastical quarrels ; that he would maintain the laws and enforce an equal toleration. To the petitions of the patriarch for the formal restoration to his see, he offered his consent if the patriarch would bury the whole question, alike the decrees of Constantinople and Nicea, in oblivion ; and in a great public assembly (assembled for the purpose), he proclaimed the worship of images a matter altogether indifferent. Yet Michael is charged with departing from his own lofty rule of toleration. The calamities of his reign, the danger of

<sup>k</sup> *ἔτι καὶ παρὰ τοῦ τοιαύτου χαριώτος.*  
This, as a fact, or an embellishment  
of the historian, is equally character-

istic.—Theoph. Contin., p. 39.

<sup>m</sup> Theophan. Contin., p. 49.

the capital and the whole empire from the invasion of the apostate Thomas, the loss of Crete and of other islands to the Saracens, were ascribed to the just vengeance of God for the persecutions of his reign.

But the worst crime of which Michael was guilty, in the sight of the image-worshippers, was the parentage and education of him whom the monkish writers call the new Belshazzar, Theophilus. Michael, in his aversion to the monastic faction, entrusted the education of his son to a man of high character, John the Grammarian, whom Theophilus in after life, having employed as his chief counsellor in civil affairs, as ambassador in the most difficult negociations, advanced at length to the see of Constantinople. Theophilus was an Oriental, his enemies no doubt said, a Mahomedan Sultan on the throne of the Roman Empire. Even his marriage, though to one wife, had something of the supercilious condescension of the lord of a hareem. The most beautiful maidens of the empire were assembled, in order that Theophilus might behold and choose his bride. Of these, Eucasia was the loveliest. Theophilus paused, and as he gazed on her beauty, in a strange moralising fit he said, with an obvious allusion to the fall, "Of how much evil hath woman been the cause?" The too ready or too devout Eucasia replied, with as evident reference to the Mother of God, "And of how much good?" Startled by her quickness and her theology, Theophilus passed on to the more gentle and modest Theodora. Eucasia retired to shroud her disappointment in a convent. The justice of Theophilus, somewhat ostentatiously displayed, was of that severe, capricious, but equitable character, which prevails where the law being part of the religion, the sovereign the hereditary head of the religion, his word is law. He was accessible to the complaints of his meanest subjects; as he passed on certain days to the church in the Blachernae, any one might personally present a petition, or demand redress. As he rode abroad, he would familiarly inquire the price of the cheapest commodities, and express his strong displeasure at what he thought exorbitant charges. One instance may show, as no doubt it did show to his subjects, the

A.D. 829.

impartiality and capricious rigour of his judgments.<sup>a</sup> Petronas, the brother of the empress, had darkened by a lofty building the dwelling of a poor widow. Once she appealed to the emperor, but Petronas, secure as he supposed in his interest, disregarded the imperial command to redress the grievance. On her second complaint, this man, who had filled offices of dignity, was ignominiously, publicly, and cruelly scourged in the market-place. The haughty, rather Roman, contempt of Theophilus for commerce, appears in his commanding a vessel full of precious Syrian merchandise to be burned, though it belonged to the Empress Theodora, reproaching her with degrading the imperial dignity to the paltry gains of commerce.<sup>o</sup> The revenues, which he had in some degree restored by economy or by better administration and increased perhaps by the despised commerce to Constantinople, he expended with Eastern magnificence. He sent a stately embassy to the caliph at Bagdad. John the Grammarian represented his sovereign, and was furnished with instructions and with presents intended to dazzle the Barbarian. Of two vessels of enormous cost, which he was to exhibit at a great feast, one was intentionally lost, that the ambassador might astonish the Saracen with his utter indifference, and produce with greater effect the second and far more splendid vase of silver, full of gold coins. A scene of gorgeous emulation took place. The caliph poured out his gold, which John affected to treat as so much dust; the caliph brought forth a hundred Christian captives, splendidly attired, and offered them to the ambassadors, who refused them till they could repay an equal number of Saracen captives. Yet all this rivalry with the Hagarene, as he is contemptuously called by contemporary history, though it soon gave place to implacable hostility and uninterrupted

Character of  
Theophilus.

<sup>a</sup> One edict, attributed to Theophilus, may remind us of the Emperor Paul of Russia. Himself being inclined to baldness, he ordained that all his subjects should cut their hair short: to let it flow over the shoulders incurred a heavy penalty.

<sup>o</sup> Gibbon (as Schlosser has observed)

has exaggerated the cruel punishments of Theophilus. With Schlosser, I find no authority for, "The principal ministers, for some venial offences, for some defect of equity or vigilance, a præfect, a quæstor, a captain of the guard, were banished or mutilated, or scalded with burning pitch, or burned in the Hippodrome."

war, would confirm with the image-worshippers the close alliance between Iconoclasm and Mohammedanism. Even in the other branch of expenditure in which Theophilus displayed his magnificence, the sumptuous buildings with which he adorned Constantinople (a palace built on the model of a Saracenic one, belonging to the caliph, in the same style, and same variety of structure and material), would display a sympathy in tastes, offensive to decent feeling.<sup>p</sup> Though among his splendid edifices churches were not wanting, one especially, dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel, called Tricinatus, from its triple apse.

A character like that of Theophilus, stern and arbitrary even in his virtues, determined in his resolutions, and void of compassion against those who offended against his justice, that is his will, was not likely, when he declared himself an Iconoclast, to conduct a religious persecution without extreme rigour. He was a man of far higher education than the former image-breaking emperors, and saw no doubt more clearly the real grounds of the controversy. Theophilus wrote poetry, if the miserable iambics with which he wished to brand the faces of some of his victims may be so called. He composed church music; some of his hymns were admitted into the church service, in which the emperor himself led the choir.<sup>q</sup>

Theophilus could not but perceive the failure, and disdain to imitate his father's temporising policy, who endeavoured to tolerate the monks, while he discouraged image-worship.<sup>r</sup> He avowed his determination to extirpate

<sup>p</sup> John the Grammarian, on his return from Syria, persuaded the Emperor *τὸ τοῦ Βασιλέως ἀνάκτορον πρὸς τὴν τῶν Σαρακενῶν κατασκευασθῆναι ὁμοίωσιν. ἐν τῇ σχήμασι καὶ ποικιλίᾳ μὲν ἐκείνῳ τὸ σύνολον παραλλάττοντα.*—Theophan. Contin., p. 98. Symeon Magister assigns a different period to this palace, which he embellishes with the Eastern luxury of *παράδωτοι*, and tanks of water. This, however, shows that already there was a peculiar Saracenic style of building, new to the Romans, and introduced into Constantinople. The fact is not unworthy of notice in the history of architecture.

<sup>q</sup> *οὐ παρετήσμεν τὸ χειρονομῆν*, leading them it should seem by the motion of his hand. The clergy appear to have made the emperor pay for the privilege of indulging his tastes. *δοὺς τῷ κλήρῳ αὐτῆς λίρας ὑπὲρ τοῦτου χρυσου ἱκανόν.*—Theophan. Contin., p. 107.

<sup>r</sup> Theophilus caused to be constructed two organs, entirely of gold, set with precious stones; and a tree of gold, on which sate birds which sang by a mechanical contrivance, the air being conveyed by hidden pipes.—Symeon Magister, p. 627.

both at once. Leo the Armenian and Michael the Stammerer had attempted to restrict the honours paid to images; Theophilus prohibited the making new ones, and ordered that in every church they should be effaced, and the walls covered with pictures of birds and beasts. The sacred vessels, adorned with figures, were profaned by unhallowed hands, sold in the public markets, and melted for their metal. The prisons were full of painters, of monks and ecclesiastics of all orders. The monks, driven from their convents, fled to desert places; some perished of cold and hunger, some threw off the proscribed dress, yet retained the sacred character and habits; others seized the opportunity of returning to the pleasures as to the dress of the world.

Yet in the mass of the monastic faction the fanaticism of the emperor was encountered by a fanaticism of resistance, sometimes silent, sullen and stubborn, sometimes glorying in provoking the wrath of the persecutor. One whole brotherhood, that of the Abrahamites, presented themselves before the emperor. They asserted on the evidence, as they said, of the most ancient fathers,\* that image-worship dated from the times of the apostles; they appealed to the pictures of the Saviour by St. Luke, and to the holy Veronica. Irritated by their obstinacy, and not likely to be convinced by such arguments, the emperor drove them with insults and severe chastisements from the city. They took refuge in a church, on an island in the Euxine, dedicated to John the Baptist *the awful*.† There they are said to have suffered martyrdom. Another stubborn monk, the emperor, in a more merciful mood, sent to his learned minister, John the Grammarian. The monk, according to the historian, reduced the minister to silence: if discomfited, the Grammarian bore his defeat with equanimity, the successful controversialist was allowed to retire and wait for better times in a monastery.

There was another monk, however, named Lazarus, a distinguished painter, whom the emperor could induce by no persuasion to abandon his idolatrous art. As milder

\* Dionysius (the pseudo Dionysius), Hierotheus, and Irenæus.

† τοῦ φοβεροῦ.

measures failed, Lazarus was cruelly scourged and imprisoned. He still persisted in exercising his forbidden skill, and hot iron plates were placed on his guilty hands. The illness of the empress saved his life; he too took refuge in the church of the Baptist, where, having recovered the use of his hands, he painted "that fearful har-binger of the Lord," and on the restoration of images, a celebrated picture of the Saviour over the gate Chalce.

Two others, Theophilus, and his brother Theodorus, for presuming to overpower the emperor in argument, and to adduce a passage in the Prophet Isaiah, not, as the emperor declared, in his copy, suffered a more cruel punishment. Their faces were branded with some wretched iambic verses, composed by the emperor; they were then banished; one died, the other survived to see the triumph of image-worship.<sup>u</sup>

This religious war seems to have been waged by the emperor on one side, and the monks on the other, with no disturbance of the general peace of the Empire. No popular tumults demand the interference of the government. The people, weary or indifferent, submitted in apathy to the alternate destruction and restoration of images. But for the fatal passion of Theophilus for war against the Saracens, in which, with great personal valour, but no less military incapacity, he was in general unsuccessful, he might have maintained the Empire during all the later years of his reign in wealth and prosperity.

The history of Iconoclasm has a remarkable uniformity.

Theodora  
empress.

Another female in power, another restoration of images. After the death of Theophilus his widow Theodora administered the empire, in the name of her youthful son Michael, called after, the Drunkard. Theodora, like her own mother Theoctista, had always worshipped images in private. Twice the dangerous secret had been betrayed to the emperor that the females of his own family practised this forbidden idolatry. On one occasion the children prattled about the pretty toys which

<sup>u</sup> All the historians (monks) relate this strange story, but the passage in Isaiah favourable to image-worship, and

forged by the monks, is rather suspicious; as well as twelve iambic verses tattooed on their faces.

their grandmother kept in a chest and took out, kissing them herself and offering them to the children's respectful kisses. Another time a dwarf, kept as a buffoon in the palace, surprised the empress taking the images, which he called by the same undignified name, from under her pillow, and paying them every kind of homage. The empress received a severe rebuke; the dwarf was well flogged for his impertinent curiosity. Theodora learned caution, but brooded in secret over her tutelar images.

No sooner was Theophilus dead than the monks, no doubt in the secret of Theodora's concealed attachment to images, poured into Constantinople from all quarters. At this juncture the brave Manuel, the general who had more than once retrieved the defeat of Theophilus, once had actually rescued him from the hands of the Saracens, and who had been appointed under the will of the emperor one of the guardians of the empire, fell dangerously ill. The monks beset his bed side, working at once on his hopes of recovery and his fears of death. Manuel yielded, and threw the weight of his authority into the party of the image-worshippers. Theodora had before feared to cope with the strength of the opposite faction, so long dominant and in possession of many of the more important civil and military dignities. She now ventured to send an officer of the palace to command the patriarch, John the Grammarian, either to recant his Iconoclastic opinions, or to withdraw from Constantinople. The patriarch is accused of a paltry artifice. He opened a vein in the region of the stomach, and showed himself wounded and bleeding to the people. The rumour spread that the empress had attempted to assassinate the patriarch. But the fraud was detected, exposed, acknowledged. The abashed patriarch withdrew unpitied and despised, into the suburbs. Methodius was raised to the dignity of the patri-<sup>A.D. 842.</sup>archate. The worshippers of images were in triumph.

But Theodora, still tenderly attached to the memory of her husband, demanded as the price of her inestimable services in the restoration of images, absolution for the sin of his Iconoclasm and his persecution of the image-worshippers. Methodius gravely replied, that the power of

the clergy to grant absolution to the living was unbounded, but of those who had died in obstinate sin, they had no authority to cancel or to mitigate the damnation. Even her own friends suspected the empress of a pious lie when she asserted, and even swore, that her husband, in the agony of death had expressed his bitter repentance, had ascribed all the calamities of his reign to his stubborn heresy, had actually entreated her to bring him the images, had passionately kissed them, and so rendered up his spirit to the ministering angels. The clergy, out of respect to the empress and zeal for their own object, did not question too closely the death-bed penitence of Theophilus; with one consent they pronounced his pardon before God, and gave a written sentence of his absolution to the empress.

All was now easy; the fanaticism of Iconoclasm was exhausted or rebuked. A solemn festival was appointed for the restoration of images. The whole clergy of Constantinople, and all who could flock in from the neighbourhood, met in and before the palace of the archbishop, and marched in procession with crosses, torches, and incense, to the church of St. Sophia. There they were met by the empress and her infant son Michael. They made the circuit of the church, with their burning torches, paying homage to every statue and picture, which had been carefully restored, never again to be effaced till the days of later, more terrible Iconoclasts, the Ottoman Turks.

Feb. 19, 842.

The Greek Church from that time has celebrated the anniversary of this festival with loyal fidelity.\* The successors of Methodius, particularly the learned Photius, were only zealous to consummate the work of his predecessors, and images have formed part of the recognised religious worship of the Eastern world.

\* Methodius was Patriarch only four years.

## CHAPTER IX.

## SEVERANCE OF GREEK AND LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

UP to the eighth century Rome had not been absolutely dissevered from the ancient and decrepit civilisation of the old Empire. After a short period of subjection to the Ostrogothic kingdom, by the conquest of <sup>Eighth</sup> century. Justinian she had sunk into a provincial city of the Eastern realm. In the eighth century she suddenly, as it were, burst the bonds of her connexion with the older state of things, disjoined herself for ever from the effete and hopeless East, and placed herself at the head of the rude as yet, and dimly descried and remote, but more promising and vigorous civilisation of the West. The Byzantine Empire became a separate world, Greek Christianity a separate religion. The West, after some struggle, created its own empire: its natives formed an independent system, either of warring or of confederate nations. Latin Christianity was the life, the principle of union, of all the West; its centre, papal Rome.

Mohammedanism—which was gradually encircling and isolating the Byzantine empire from its outlying provinces, obtaining the naval superiority in the Mediterranean, and subjecting the islands to her sway, which, with the yet unconverted Bulgarians, fully occupied all the Eastern armies, and left the Emperor without power to protect or even keep in subjection the Exarchate and the Italian dependencies—was the remoter cause of the emancipation of the West. The Koran thus in some degree, by breaking off all correspondence with the East, contributed to deliver the Pope from a distant and arbitrary master, and to relieve him from that harassing rivalry with which the patriarch of Constantinople constantly renewed his pretensions to equality or to superiority; and so to place him alone in undisputed dignity at the head of Western Christendom. But the

immediate cause of this disruption and final severance between the East and West was the Iconoclasm of the Eastern emperors. Other signs of estrangement might seem to forebode this inevitable revolution. The line of Justinian, the conqueror of Italy, after it had been deposed and had re-assumed the Empire in the person of the younger emperor of that name, was now extinct. Adventurer after adventurer had risen to power, and this continual revolution could not but weaken the attachment, especially of foreign subjects, who might think, or chose to think, succession and hereditary descent the only strong titles to their obedience. Rome and Italy must thus ignominiously acknowledge every rude or low-born soldier whom the rabble of Constantinople, the court, or more powerful army, might elevate to the throne.

The exarchal government from the first had only been powerful to tyrannise and feeble to protect: the Exarchs of Ravenna. Exarch was like the satrap of an old Eastern monarchy; and this was more and more sensibly felt throughout Italy. Without abandoning any of its inferior demands on the obedience, this rule was becoming less and less able to resist the growing power and enterprise of the Lombards, or even to preserve the peace of the Italian dependencies. The exarchate had still strength to levy tribute, to enforce heavy taxation, the produce of which was sent to Constantinople. It repaid these burthens but scantily by any of the defensive or conservative offices of government. During the pontificate of John VI., the Exarch Theophylact had only been protected from the resentment of his own soldiery by the interference of the pope. The most unambitious pontiff might wish to detach his country and his people from the falling fortunes of the Byzantine Empire. If he looked to Rome, its allegiance to the East was but of recent date, the conquest of Justinian; if to his own position, he could not but know that the successor of St. Peter held a much higher place, both as to respect and authority, before he had sunk into a subject of Constantinople. Never till this period in the papal annals had a pope been summoned, like a meaner subject, to give an account of his spiritual proceedings in a foreign city; nor had he

been seized and hurried away, with insult and cruel ill usage, to Constantinople, and, like the unhappy Martin, left to perish in exile.

Whatever lingering loyalty, under these trying circumstances, might prevail in Italy, or in the mind of the pontiff, to the old Roman government—whatever repugnance to the yoke of Barbarians, which might seem the only alternative when they should cease to be the subjects of the Empire—these bonds of attachment were at once rudely broken when the emperor became an heresiarch; not a speculative heresiarch on some abstract and mysterious doctrine, but the head of a heresy which struck at the root of the popular religion—of the daily worship of the people. In general estimation, an Iconoclastic Emperor almost ceased to be a Christian: his tenets were those of a Jew or a Mohammedan. In the East the emperor, from fear, from persuasion, or from conviction, obtained, at one time at least, a formidable party in his favour, even among the clergy; but for the monks, images might have disappeared from the East. In the West, iconoclasm was met with universal aversion and hostility. The Italian mind had rivalled the Greek in the fertility with Image-worship in Italy. which it had fostered the growth of image-worship: it adhered to it with stronger pertinacity. The expressive symbol of the fourth century, and the suggestive picture, which was, in the time of Gregory the Great, to be the book of Scripture to the unlearned, had expanded into the fondest attachment to the images of saints and martyrs, the Virgin, and the Saviour. In this as in all the other great controversies, from good fortune, from sagacity, from sympathy with the popular feeling, its adherents would say from a higher guidance, the papacy took the popular and eventually successful side. The pope was again not the dictator, he was the representative of the religious mind of the age. One of the more recent popes, the timid John VII., a Greek by birth, might seem almost prophetically to have committed the papal see to the support of image-worship, and resistance to an iconoclastic emperor. In a chapel which he dedicated in John VII. honour of the Virgin, in the church of St. Peter, the walls

were inlaid with pictures of the holy fathers; and throughout Rome he lavishly adorned the churches with pictures and statues. Gregory II. had no doubt often worshipped in public before these works of his holy predecessor.

The character of Gregory II. does not warrant the belief that he had formed any deliberate plan of policy for the alienation of Italy from the Eastern Empire. He was actuated not by worldly but by religious passions—by zeal for images, not by any splendid vision of the independence of Italy. For where indeed could be found the protecting, the organising, the administrative and ruling power which could replace the abrogated authority of the Empire? The papacy had not yet aspired to the attributes and functions of temporal sovereignty.

In Italy the Lombard kingdom in the north, with its kindred dukedoms of Benevento and Spoleto in the south, alone possessed the strength and vigour of settled government.<sup>a</sup> Under the long and comparatively peaceful reign of Rotharis, it had enjoyed what appears almost fabulous prosperity: it had its code of laws. Liutprand now filled the throne, a prince of great ambition and enterprise. If the papacy had entered into a confederacy of interests with the Lombard kings, and contenting itself with spiritual power, by which it might have ruled almost uncontrolled over Barbarian monarchs, and with large ecclesiastical possessions without sovereign rights, Italy might again perhaps have been consolidated into a great kingdom. But this policy, which the papacy was too Roman to pursue with the Gothic kings, or which was repudiated as bringing a powerful temporal monarch in too close collision with the supreme pontiff, was even less likely to be adopted with the Lombards.<sup>b</sup> Between the papal see and the Lombard sovereigns—indeed between the Lombards and the Italian clergy—there seems almost from first to last to have prevailed an implacable and inexplicable antipathy. Of all

<sup>a</sup> From 635 to 651. During all this period Catholic and Arian bishops presided over their separate congregations in most of the cities of Italy.—Le Beau, *Bas Empire*, lviii. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Yet the Lombards had more than once defended the Pope against the

Exarch.—Epist. Orladi. Episcop. Mediol. ad Carol. M. de Translat. S. Augustin. Orlad says of Liutprand, that he was “protector et defensor fidelis Ecclesiarum Dei . . . Christianissimus fuit ac religionis amator.”

the conquerors of Italy, these (according to more favourable historians) orderly and peaceful people are represented as the most irreclaimably savage. The taint of their original Arianism was indelible. No terms are too strong with the popes to express their detestation of the Lombards.

According to the course of events, as far as it can be traced in chronological order, Gregory remained wavering and confounded by these simultaneous but conflicting passions: his determination to resist an iconoclastic emperor, and his dread of the Lombard supremacy in Italy. Up to the tenth year of his pontificate he had been occupied by the more peaceful duties of his station. He had averted the aggressions of the Lombard dukes on the patrimony of St. Peter; he had commissioned Boniface to preach the Gospel in Germany; he had extended <sup>A.D. 709.</sup> his paternal care over the churches in England. No doubt, even if his more formal epistles had not yet been delivered, he had expostulated repeatedly, frequently, if not by private letters, probably by other missives, with the emperor on the first appearances of his hostility to images.\*

But the fatal edict came to Italy as to one of the provinces subject to the Emperor Leo. The Exarch <sup>Iconoclastic edict.</sup> Scholasticus commanded it to be published in the <sup>A.D. 728.</sup> city of Ravenna. The people broke out in instant insurrection, declared their determination to renounce their allegiance rather than permit their churches to be despoiled of their holiest ornaments, attacked the soldiery, and maintained a desperate conflict for the mastery <sup>A.D. 727.</sup> of the city. Liutprand, the Lombard king, had been watching in eager expectation of this strife to expel the exarch, and to add the whole Roman territory to his dominions. With a large force he sat down before Ravenna. Though the garrison made a vigorous <sup>Lombards take Ravenna.</sup> defence, Liutprand, by declaring himself a devout worshipper of images, won the populace to his party; Ravenna

\* On the first intelligence of the Emperor's open iconoclasm, the Pope sent every where letters, "cavere se Christianos, quod orta fuisset impietas." —Vit. Greg. II.

surrendered; the troops of Liutprand spread without resistance over the whole Pentapolis.

Gregory was alarmed, for if he hated the heretical emperor, he had no less dread and dislike of the conquering Lombard.<sup>d</sup> The establishment of this odious sovereignty throughout Italy, which had been so long making its silent aggressions in the South, with a king of the unmeasured ambition and ability of Liutprand, was even more formidable to the pope than the effete tyranny of Constantinople.<sup>e</sup>

Gregory first discerned, among her islands and marshes, the rising power of Venice, equally jealous and himself of the extension of the Lombard power. There the exarch had taken refuge. At the instigation of Gregory a league was formed of the maritime forces of Venice, already of some importance, nominally with the exarch, really with the pope, and the whole Roman or Byzantine troops. Ravenna was retaken while Liutprand was at Pavia, and before he could collect his army to relieve it.

Gregory was still outwardly a loyal subject of the emperor, but the breach was inevitable. Iconoclasm had now become fanaticism with Leo; and Gregory, whether his celebrated letters had yet been despatched or were only in preparation, was as resolute in his assertion of image-worship. Rumours spread, and were generally believed, that the Iconoclast had sent orders to seize or to murder the pope. Each successive officer who was sent to retrieve the imperial affairs was supposed to be charged with this impious mission. Leo, no doubt, would have scrupled as little as his predecessors to order the apprehension of the refractory prelate, and his transportation to Constantinople; nor if blood had been shed in resistance to his commands, would he have considered it an inexpiable crime.<sup>f</sup> But the pope believed himself, or declared his belief, that he was menaced with secret assassination. Three persons are

<sup>d</sup> "Quia, peccato favente, Ravennatum civitas, quæ caput extat omnium. a non dicendâ gente Longobardorum capta est."—Greg. Epist. x.

The chronology is so uncertain, that I have been constrained to follow

sometimes one authority, sometimes another—Baronius, Pagi, Muratori—and so have endeavoured to trace the historical sequence of events.

<sup>f</sup> Comp. Muratori sub ann. dccxxvii.

named—the Duke Basil, Jordan the Chartulary, and John surnamed Lurion—as meditating this crime, under the sanction first of Marinus, Duke of the city of Rome, afterwards of Paul, who was sent as Exarch to restore the imperial ascendancy. Two of these murderers were killed by the people; the third, Basil, turned monk to save his life.<sup>5</sup> Paul the Exarch occupied Ravenna, which, with the Pentapolis, with Rome and Naples, were the only parts of Italy still in possession of the emperor, though Venice owned a doubtful allegiance. It was announced that the Exarch intended to march to Rome to depose the Pope, and at the same time measures were to be taken to destroy the images in the churches throughout Italy. The whole territory—Venice, the Pentapolis, Rome—at once rose up in defence of the Pope. They declared that they would not recognise the commission of Paul; his generals began to contemplate their separate independence. They were only prevented by the prudence of Gregory from proclaiming a new emperor, and sending him against Constantinople. The crafty Lombards again joined the popular cause. Exhilaratus, Duke of Naples, said to have plotted against the pope's life, was slain with his son. Ravenna was divided between the papal and imperial factions. The Exarch fell in the tumult. The Lombards were the gainers in all these commotions: they occupied all the strong places in the Exarchate and in the Pentapolis.

A new Exarch, the last Exarch of Ravenna, Eutychius, landed at Naples. He is likewise accused of designing to send a band of assassins to Rome, to murder, not only the Pope, but also the chief nobles of the city. But for the intervention of the Pope, they would have retaliated by sending assassins to kill the Exarch. A fearful state of Christian society when such acts, if not designed, were believed to be designed by both parties.

All Rome pledged itself by a solemn oath to live and die in defence of their Pontiff<sup>h</sup>—the protector of the images

<sup>5</sup> Gregory is silent in his letters about these attempts at assassination. But the letters may have been written, even if not delivered, before this date.

<sup>h</sup> "Qui ex scriptis nefandam viri

(Exarchi) dolositatem despicientes una se quasi fratres Romani atque Longobardi catenâ fidei constrinxerunt cuncti mortem pro defensione Pontificis sustinere gloriosam."—Olradi, Epist.

in their churches. The Lombards were equally loud in their protestations of reverence for his person. The ban of excommunication was issued against the Exarch, the odious mutilator and destroyer of those holy memorials. Eutychius at first attempted to alienate the Lombards from the papal interest, but it now suited the politic Liutprand to adhere in the closest league to the rebellious Romans. Eutychius had not offered a tempting price for his alliance. Some time after, coveting the independent dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, Liutprand entered into secret negotiations with the Exarch. The dukedoms by this treaty were to be the share of the Lombard king, Rome to be restored to its allegiance to the emperor. Liutprand

A.D. 729.

having made himself master of Spoleto, and thus partly gained his own ends, advanced to Rome, and encamped in the field of Nero.<sup>1</sup> The Pope, like his predecessors, went forth to overawe by his commanding sanctity this new Barbarian conqueror, who threatened the Holy City. It pleased Liutprand to be overawed; he was not too sincere in his design to restore the imperial authority in Rome. He played admirably the part of a pious son of the Church; his conduct, as doubtless he intended, contrasted no little to his advantage with the sacrilegious Iconoclast Leo. He cast himself at the feet of the Pope,

Liutprand in Rome.

he put off his armour, and all his splendid dress, his girdle, his sword, his gauntlets, his royal mantle, his crown of gold, and a cross of silver, and offered them at the tomb of the Apostle. He entreated the Pope (his arguments were not likely to be ineffectual) to make peace with the Exarch. So completely did harmony appear to be restored, that the Pope and the Exarch united in suppressing an insurrection raised by a certain Petasius, who proclaimed himself emperor under the title of Tiberius III. The Exarch, with the aid of the Romans, seized the usurper, and sent his head to Constantinople. After this the Exarch probably retired to Ravenna, and must at least have suspended all active measures for the suppression of image-worship.

A.D. 730.

Throughout these transactions the Pope appears actually

<sup>1</sup> Anastasius, Vit.

if not openly an independent power, leaguings with the allies or the enemies of the Empire, as might suit the exigences of the time; yet the share of Gregory II. in the revolt of Italy has been exaggerated by those who boast of this glorious precedent and example for the assertion of the ecclesiastical power, as depriving an heretical subject of his authority over part of his realm, and striking the Imperial Head with the impartial thunders of excommunication; so also by those who charge him with the sin of rebellion against heaven-constituted monarchy. If, as is said, he proceeded to the hostile measure of forbidding the Italian subjects of Leo to pay their tribute; if by a direct excommunication he either virtually or avowedly released the subjects of the Emperor from their allegiance<sup>k</sup> (his own language in his letters by no means takes this haughty or unsubmitive tone), his object was not the emancipation of Italy, but the preservation of images, in which Gregory was as fanatically sincere as the humblest monk in his diocese.

No doubt a council was summoned and held at Rome by Gregory II., in which anathemas were launched against the destroyers of images. If, Nov. 730. Council at Rome. however, the emperor was by name excommunicated by the pope, this was not and could not be, as in later times with the kings and emperors of Western Europe, an absolute and total exclusion from Christian privileges and Christian rites. It was a disruption of all communion with the Bishop of Rome, and his orthodox Italian subjects.<sup>m</sup> No doubt there was a latent assertion that the Roman church was the one true church, and that beyond that church there was no salvation; but the Patriarch of Constantinople recognised no such power in the Roman pontiff, unless himself joined in the anathema; and Anastasius, the present Patriarch, was now an ardent destroyer of images.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>k</sup> Theophanes, iv. c. 5 (p. 621); after him by Glycas, Zonaras, Cedrenus. See likewise Anastasius.

<sup>m</sup> Walch makes two sensible observations; first, that the revolt of Italy and the extinction of the Exarchate was not complete till after the death of both

Gregorys; secondly, that the excommunication of the Emperor by the Pope was not an exclusion from all spiritual privileges, but merely a refusal to communicate with him.

<sup>n</sup> In the reference to the council in the letter of Pope Hadrian to Charle-

Leo revenged himself by severing the Transadriatic provinces, the Illyrica, from the Roman patriarchate, and by confiscating the large estates of the see of Rome in Calabria and Sicily. He appears too to have chosen this unfortunate time for an increase in the taxation of those provinces. A new census was ordered with a view to a more productive capitation tax. The discontent at these exactions would no doubt strengthen the general resistance to the measures of Leo; and perhaps Gregory's prohibition of the payment to the imperial revenue may have been but resistance to these unprecedented burthens.

Such was the relation between the see of Rome and the Eastern Empire at the death of Gregory II. His successor, Gregory III., was of Syrian birth. At the funeral of the deceased pope, the clergy and the whole people broke out into a sudden acclamation, and declared Gregory III. his successor. But he was not consecrated till the ensuing month. So far was this election from a deliberate renunciation of allegiance to the Empire, or an assertion of independence on the part of the Pope or the Roman people, that the confirmation of the election by the Exarch at Ravenna was dutifully awaited before the Pope assumed his authority. Nor did Gregory III. break off or suspend his direct intercourse with the seat of government. His first act is a mission to Constantinople to announce his adherence to the doctrines of his predecessor on image-worship; and though his inflexible language was not likely to conciliate the Emperor, this mission and much of the subsequent conduct of Gregory show that the separation of Italy from the Empire was, at least, even if remotely contemplated, no avowed object of the papal policy. The first message was entrusted to George the Presbyter, but its language was so sternly and haughtily condemnatory of the Emperor's religious proceedings, that the trembling ambassador had hardly begun his journey when he fled back to Rome and acknowledged that he had not courage for this dangerous mission. The Pope was so indignant at

magne, p. 1460, he does not mention, though he does not exclude the notion of the excommunication of the Emperor.

The council was held in Nov. 730; Gregory died Feb. 731.

this want of sacerdotal daring, that he threatened to degrade the Presbyter, and was hardly persuaded to impose a lighter penance. Once more George <sup>A.D. 732.</sup> was ordered to set out for the court of Leo; he was arrested in Sicily, and not allowed to proceed. Gregory, finding his remonstrances vain or unheard, assumed a bolder attitude.

The council held by Gregory III. was formed with great care and solemnity. It was intended to be the declaration of defiance on the subject of images <sup>Nov. 1. 732.</sup> from all Italy. The archbishops of Grado and Ravenna, with ninety-three other prelates or presbyters of the apostolic see, with the deacons and the rest of the clergy, the consuls and the people of Rome, pronounced their decree that, whoever should overthrow, mutilate, profane, blaspheme the venerable images of Christ our God and Lord, of the immaculate and glorious Virgin, of the blessed apostles and saints, was banished from all communion in the body and blood of Christ, and from the unity of the Church.

This solemn edict was sent to Constantinople by Constantine, the defender of the city. Constantine also was arrested in Sicily, his letters taken away, and, after an imprisonment of a year, he was allowed to return to Rome to report the bad success of his mission. Another address was sent in the name of the people of Italy, urging their attachment to the images, and imploring the emperor to annul his fatal statute. This, with two expostulatory letters from the pope, got not beyond Sicily. The messengers were seized by Sergius, the commander of the imperial troops, confined for eight months, sent back with every indignity to Rome, and menaced with the punishment of traitors and rebels if they should venture to land again in Sicily.

In Rome Gregory III. set the example of image-worship on the most splendid scale. He had obtained six pillars of precious marble from the Exarch at Ravenna, and arranged them in order with six others of equal value. These he overlaid with the purest silver, on which, on one side, were represented the Saviour and the apostles, on

the other the Mother of God with the holy virgins. In an oratory of the same church he enshrined, in honour of the Saviour and the Virgin, relics of the apostles, the martyrs, and saints of all the world. Among his other costly offerings was an image of the Holy Mother of God, having a diadem of gold and jewels, a golden collar with pendant gems, and earrings with six jacinths. In the Church of the Virgin was another image of the Mother, with the Divine Infant in her arms, adorned with pearls of great weight and size. Many other of the churches in Rome and in the neighbourhood were decorated with images of proportionate splendour.

The Emperor, about this time, made his last desperate effort to retrieve his fortunes in Italy, to relieve the Exarch Eutychius, who was shut up in powerless inactivity in Ravenna, and to reduce the refractory pope and Italy to obedience. A formidable armament was embarked on board a great fleet, under the command of Manes, one of his bravest and most experienced generals. The fleet encountered a terrible storm in the Adriatic; great part of the ships was lost; and the image-worshippers on the coast of Calabria beheld their shores strewn with the wrecks of the Iconoclastic navy. Henceforth the Eastern Empire almost acquiesced in the loss of the exarchate. Eutychius maintained for a long time his perilous position in Ravenna, temporising between the pope, the Lombards, and the Franks. Nearly twenty years later he abandoned the seat of government, and took refuge in Naples.

Loss of Em-  
peror's fleet.

Flight of the  
Exarch.

Now, however, that the real power of the empire in Italy was extinguished, it might seem that nothing could resist the Lombards. Though King Liutprand and Gregory III., at least for the first eight years of Gregory's pontificate, maintained their outward amity, the Lombards though not now Arian, were almost equally objects of secret abhorrence to the Catholic and the Roman. Italy must again become a Barbarian kingdom, the Pope the subject of a sovereign at his gates or within his city.

At this juncture the attention of Europe, of all Christendom, is centered upon the Franks. The great victory of Tours had raised Charles Martel to the rank of the

protector of the liberties of the religion of the Western world, from the all-conquering Mohammedans. It was almost the first,<sup>o</sup> unquestionably the greatest defeat which that power had suffered, from the time that it advanced beyond the borders of Arabia, and having yet found no limits to its conquests in the East, had swept westward over Africa, Spain, and Southern Gaul, and seemed destined to envelope the whole world.

Charles Martel.  
A.D. 729.

The Pope was thus compelled, invited, encouraged by every circumstance to look for protection, unless he submitted to the abhorred Lombard, beyond the Alps.<sup>p</sup> The Franks alone of Barbarian nations had from the first been converted to orthodoxy, and adhered to it with unshaken fidelity. The Franks had dutifully listened to the papal recommendation of Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, had countenanced and assisted his holy designs for the conversion of the Teutonic tribes beyond the Rhine. Already had Gregory II. opened a communication with the Franks; already, before the dissolution of the Byzantine power, had secret negotiations begun to secure their aid against the Lombards.<sup>q</sup> Eight or nine years of doubtful peace, at least of respectful mutual understanding, had intervened; when, almost on a sudden, the Lombards and the Pope are involved in open war, and Gregory III. throws himself boldly on the faith and loyalty of the mighty Frank. He sends the mystic keys of the Sepulchre of St.

A.D. 739.

Peter and filings of his chains as gifts, which no Christian could resist—he offers the significant yet undefined title of Roman Consul. The letter of Gregory in the following year appeals in the most piteous tone to the commiseration and piety of the Barbarian. “His tears are falling day and night for the desti-

Gregory appeals to Charles Martel.

<sup>o</sup> The bloody defeat of Tholouse by Count Eudes led to no result.

<sup>p</sup> Luitprand marched across the Alps but the year before in aid of Charles Martel against the Saracens, who had again appeared in formidable force in the South of France.

<sup>q</sup> The authority for this important fact is Anastasius in his Life of Stephen III., who, in his dispute with King Astolph, “cerneas præsertim, ab imperiali po-

tentiâ nullum esse subveniendi auxilium, tunc quemadmodum prædecessores ejus beatæ memoriæ dominus Gregorius et Gregorius alter, et dominus Zacharias, beatissimi pontifices Carolo excellentissimæ memoriæ, Regi Francorum direxerunt, petentes sibi subveniri, propter impressiones ac invasiones quas et ipsi in hac Romanorum provinciâ a nefanda Longobardorum gente perpassi sunt.” Charles Martel was not king.

tute state of the Church. The Lombard king and his son are ravaging by fire and sword the last remains of the property of the Church, which no longer suffices for the sustenance of the poor, or to provide lights for the daily service. They

had invaded the territory of Rome and seized all his  
A.D. 740.

farms;† his only hope was in the timely succour of the Frankish king. Gregory knew that the Lombards were negotiating with the Frank, and dexterously appeals to his pride. "The Lombards are perpetually speaking of him with contempt,—'Let him come, this Charles, with his army of Franks; if he can, let him rescue you out of our hands.' O unspeakable grief, that such sons so insulted should make no effort to defend their holy mother the Church!" Not that St. Peter is unable to protect his successors, and to exact vengeance upon their oppressors; but the apostle is putting the faith of his followers to trial. Believe not the Lombard kings, that their only object is to punish their refractory subjects, the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, whose only crime is that they will not join in the invasion and the plunder of the Roman see. Send, O my most Christian son! some faithful officer, who may report to you truly the condition of affairs here; who may behold with his own eyes the persecutions we are enduring, the humiliation of the Church, the desolation of our property, the sorrow of the pilgrims who frequent our shrines. Close not your ears against our supplications, lest St. Peter close against you the gates of heaven. I conjure you by the living and true God, and by the keys of St. Peter, not to prefer the alliance of the Lombards to the love of the great apostle, but hasten, hasten to our succour, that we may say with the prophet, 'The Lord hath heard us in the day of tribulation, the God of Jacob hath protected us.'"

The letter of Gregory III. seems rather like the cry of sudden distress than part of a deliberate scheme of policy. He is in an agony of terror at the formidable invasion of the Lombards, which threatens to absorb Rome in the kingdom of Liutprand; succour from the East is hopeless;

† In partibus Ravennatum.

• Fredegar. Contin. apud Bouquet, ii. 457.

he turns to any quarter where he may find a powerful protector, and that one protector is Charles Martel. From the Lombard king he had not much right to expect forbearance, for it is clear that he had encouraged the duke of Spoleto, the vassal, as the ambitious Liutprand asserted, of the Lombard kingdom, in rebellion against his master. Duke Thrasimund had fled for refuge to Rome; and from Rome he had gone forth, not unaided, to reconquer his dukedom. The troops of Liutprand had overrun the Roman territory; they were wasting the estates of the Church. Liutprand had severed four cities, Amelia, Orta, Polymartia, and Blera, from the Roman territory.<sup>1</sup> Some expressions in Gregory's second letter to Charles almost imply that he had entered Rome and plundered the Church of St. Peter.<sup>2</sup> So nearly did Rome become a A.D. 741. Lombard city.

These acts of Gregory III. mark the period of transition from the old to the new political system of Europe. They proclaimed the severance of all connexion with the East. The Pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a Transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy, and thus taking the lead in that total revolution in the great social system of Europe, the influence of which still survives in the relations between the Transalpine nations and Italy. The step to papal aggrandisement, though yet unpremeditated, is immense. The Pope a temporal power. Latin Christendom is forming into a separate realm, of which the Pope is the head. Henceforth the Pope, if not yet a temporal sovereign, is a temporal potentate.

<sup>1</sup> Ab eodem rege ablatae sunt et Ducatu Romano quatuor civitates.—Anastasius.

<sup>2</sup> Baronius drew this inference from the words of Gregory. Muratori contests the point, which is not very probable, and is not mentioned by Anastasius. Muratori explains the words "omnia enim lumina in honorem ipsius principis Apostolorum . . . ipsi abstulerunt. Unde et Ecclesia Sancti Petri denudata est, et in nimiam desolationem redacta," as relating to the devastation of the Church estates; "che servivano alla Luminaria d' essa Chiesa, ed al sovvenimento de' Poveri." But

he has omitted the intermediate words, "et quæ a vestris parentibus, et a vobis oblata sunt." The lights or chandeliers, the oblations of former Frankish kings or of Charles, can scarcely be explained but of the actual ornaments of the Church. St. Peter's may have been plundered without the fall of the whole of Rome. The siege of Rome is mentioned among the military exploits of Liutprand in his epitaph. Compare Gregor. Epist. ii. ad Carol. Martel. Baronius and Muratori, sub ann. dcccxi. Gretser published the two letters in his volume of the *Epistolæ Pontificum*.

Speculation may lead to no satisfactory result, but it is difficult not to speculate on the extent to which the popes may have had more or less distinct conceptions as to the results of their own measures. Was their alliance with the Franks beyond the Alps, even if at first the impulse of immediate necessity, and only to gain the protection of the nearest powerful rival to the hated Lombards, confined to that narrow aim? How soon began to dawn the vision of a spiritual kingdom over the whole West—the revival of a Western Empire beyond the Alps, now that the East had abandoned or lost its authority—or at least of some form of Roman government under which the title of consul or patrician should be borne by a Transalpine sovereign thus bound to protect Rome, while the real authority should rest with the pope? Some ambiguous expressions in Gregory's epistle sound like an offer of sovereignty to Charles Martel. He sends him the keys of the tomb of St. Peter as a symbol of allegiance, and appears to acknowledge his royal supremacy.<sup>7</sup> The account of the solemn embassy which conveyed these supplicatory letters asserts that the Pope offered to the Frankish ruler the titles of Patrician and Consul of Rome, thus transferring, if not the sovereignty, the duty and honour of guarding the imperial city, the metropolis of Christendom, to a foreign ruler. According to another statement, he spoke not in his own name alone, but in that of the Roman people, who, having thrown off the dominion of the Eastern empire, placed themselves under the protection of his clemency.<sup>8</sup>

Charles  
Martel.

Charles Martel had received the first mission of Gregory III. with magnificence, yet not without hesitation. The Lombards used every effort to avert his interference in the affairs of Italy; and some gratitude was due to Liutprand, who had rendered him powerful service: according to the Lombard's epitaph, he had fought in person for the cause of Christendom against the Saracens in Aquitaine.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> "Per ipsas sacratissimas Claves Confessionis Beati Petri, quas vobis ad regnum direximus."—Greg. Epist. ii.

<sup>8</sup> *Annales Metenses.*

<sup>9</sup> The lines relating to the siege

of Rome, which the poet places first, and this fact, run thus:—

"Roma suas vires jam pridem mille multo Obsessa expavit, deinde tremuere feroces Usque Saraceni, quos dispulit impiger, ipso Cum premerent Gallus, Karolo poscente Juvare."  
*Note to Paul. Diacon. apud Muratori, c. viii.*

But Charles returned a courteous answer, sent presents to Rome, and directed Grimon, abbot of Corbey, and Sigebert, a monk of St. Denys, to proceed with the ambassadors to the imperial city.

Not the least extraordinary part of this memorable transaction is the strangely discrepant character in which Charles Martel appeared to the Pope and to the clergy of his own country. While the Pope is offering him the sovereignty of Rome, and appealing to his piety, as the champion of the Church of St. Peter, he is condemned by the ecclesiastics beyond the Alps as the sacrilegious spoiler of the property of the Church; as a wicked tyrant who bestowed bishoprics on his counts and dukes, expelled his own relative, the rightful Archbishop of Rheims, and replaced him by a prelate who had only received the tonsure. A saint of undoubted authority beheld in a vision the ally of the popes, the designated Consul of Rome, the sovereign at whose feet were laid the keys of St. Peter's sepulchre, tormented in the lowest pit of hell. So completely had this view worked into the Christian mind, that Dante, the faithful recorder of popular Catholic tradition, adopts the condemnatory legend, and confirms the authority of the saint's vision.

---

## CHAPTER X.

## HIERARCHY OF FRANCE.

THE origin of this hostility between Charles Martel and the hierarchy of France throws us back nearly a century, to the rise of the mayors of the palace, who had now long ruled over the pageant Merovingian kings, the do-nothing kings of that race, the Lamas of the West; and to the enormous accumulation of wealth, territory, and power acquired by the bishops and monasteries of France. The state of this great Church, the first partly Teutonic Church, and its influence on the coming revolution in Latin Christianity and on the papal power, must justify the digression. The

A.D. 637.

kingly power of the race of Clovis expired with Dagobert I. In each of the kingdoms, when the realm was divided—above the throne, when it was one kingdom—rose the Mayor of the Palace, in whom was vested the whole kingly power. But the Franks now at least shared with the Romans the great hierarchical dignities: they were bishops, abbots. If they brought into the order secular ambition, ferocity, violence, feudal animosity, they brought also a vigour and energy of devotion, a rigour of asceticism, a sternness of monastic virtue. It was an age of saints: every city, every great monastery boasts, about this time, the tutelar patron of its church; legend is the only history; while at the same time fierce bishops surpass the fierce counts and barons in crime and bloodshed, and the holiest, most devout, most self-denying saints are mingling in the furious contest, or the most subtle intrigue. This Teutonising of the hierarchy was at once the consequence and the cause of the vast territorial possessions of the Church, and of the subsequent degradation and inevitable plunder of the Church. This was a new aristocracy, not as the Roman hierarchy had been, of influence and superior civilisation, but of birth, ability, ambition,

mingled with ecclesiastical authority,<sup>a</sup> and transcendent display of all which was esteemed in those times perfect and consummate Christianity. Nor were the bishops strong in their own strength alone. The peaceful passion for monachism had become a madness which seized on the strongest, sometimes the fiercest souls. Monasteries arose in all quarters, and gathered their tribute of wealth from all hands. The translation of the remains of St. Benedict to Fleury on the Loire was a national ovation. All ages, ranks, classes, races, crowded to the holy ceremony. Of the sons of Dagobert, Sigebert, who ruled in Austrasia, passed his life in peaceful works of piety. The only royal acts which he was permitted to perform were lavish donations to bishops and to monasteries.<sup>b</sup> On the death of his brother, Clovis II. of Neustria,<sup>c</sup> the widow Bathildis was raised to the regency in the name of her infant son, Clotaire III. Bathildis succeeded to some part of the authority, to none of the crimes or ambition, of Brunehaut or Fredegonde. She was a Saxon captive of exquisite beauty. Erthinwold, the Neustrian mayor of the palace, sacrificing his own honourable passion to his ambition, married her to the king, Clovis II. Queen Bathildis was the holiest and most devout of women; her pious munificence knew no bounds; remembering her own bondage, she set apart vast sums for the redemption of captives. Not a cathedral, not a monastery, but records the splendid donations of Queen Bathildis: not farms or manses, but forests, districts, almost provinces.<sup>d</sup> The high-born Frankish

<sup>a</sup> It is not easy to trace this slow and gradual Teutonising of the higher clergy. The names are not sure indications of birth: Romans sometimes barbarised their names.—Guizot, *Essai* V. iii. 2; Hallam, *Supplemental note*, p. 75.

<sup>b</sup> Vita S. Sigeberti, apud Bouquet, ii. He founded twelve monasteries.

<sup>c</sup> Sigebert and Clovis died about the same time, 654, 655.

<sup>d</sup> "La trace de ses bienfaits se retrouve dans les archives de toutes les grandes abbayes de son temps. Luxeuil et d'autres monastères de Bourgogne en reçurent de grandes sommes et des terres. Dans le voisinage de Troyes, S. Fro-

doard obtint un vaste terrain marécageux nommé l'Isle Germanique, d'où il fit sortir la florissante abbaye de Moustier-la-belle. Curbion ou Moutier S. Lomer reçut la grande ville de Nogaret, plusieurs talents d'or et d'argent . . . elle accorde beaucoup de présents, une grande forêt, et des pâturages du domaine royal au fondateur de Jumièges, S. Filibert. . . Clotaire, sur les conseils de Bathilde, augmente les vastes domaines de Fontenelle . . . cité modèle où quinze cent travailleurs étaient enrôlés avec neuf cent moines. Bathilde eut encore . . . sa part dans la munificence de Clovis II. et de Clotaire III. envers les monastères de Saint Denys en France, de Saint

bishop, Leodegar (the St. Leger of later worship), had been raised by the sole power of Bathildis to the great Burgundian bishopric of Autun. Legend dwells with fond pertinacity on the holiness of the saint; sterner but more veracious history cannot but detect the ambitious and turbulent head of a great faction. There was a fierce and obstinate strife for the mayoralty; France must become a theocracy; the Bishop of Autun, if not in name, in power would alone possess that dignity. His rival Ebroin, the actual mayor, entered into internecine strife with the aspiring hierarchy: none but that hierarchy has handed down the short dark annals of the time, and Ebroin has been chronicled as the most monstrously wicked of men. Under the rule of Ebroin, it was said by his authority, the Bishop of Paris was murdered for his pride; but Ebroin fell before the fiercer aggression of Leodegar, the Burgundian bishop, who was supported by all the forces of Burgundy. It was held to be a splendid effort of Christian virtue that the saint spared the life of Ebroin. He was banished to the monastery of Luxeuil (the foundation of St. Columban), compelled to give up his wife, to submit to the tonsure, and to take the irrevocable vows. Leodegar ruled supreme, and in the highest episcopal splendour, in his cathedral city of Autun. If his poetical biographer is right, he assumed even the title of mayor of the palace.<sup>o</sup> But the haughty Neustrian nobility became weary of the rule of a woman and of bishops; Bathildis surrendered her power, and retired to her convent of Chelles.

By a sudden revolution the Bishop of Autun found himself an exile in the same monastery with his fallen rival, that of Luxeuil.<sup>f</sup> The bishop had sternly condemned the marriage of the King Childeric (Austrasia and Neustria had become again one kingdom) with his cousin-german, Bili-

Vincent de Paris, de Fleury sur Loire, et de St. Maur de Fosses." St. Maur had the honour of possessing the bodies of St. Benedict and of St. Maur.—D. Pitra, *Vie de St. Leger*, p. 141. "Ainsi combla-t-elle de largesses les églises de S. Denys, et de S. Germain de Paris, de S. Médard de Soissons, de S. Pierre de Chartres, de S. Anian d'Or-

léans, de S. Martin de Tours."—P. 145. See, too, the donations of Dagobert II., p. 356.

<sup>o</sup> "Quippe domus major penitus, rectorque creatus Antistes meritis suscepit jura regenda Aulæ post regem."

*MS.*, printed by M. Pitra, 472. <sup>f</sup> See the pleasing description of Luxeuil—Lucens ovile, apud Pitra.

hildis. He was accused of a conspiracy against the life of the king. Affairs again wheeled round; Childeric was murdered; Ebroin and Leodegar, reconciled by their common misfortune, if not by their common religion, set forth together from their convent, ere long to strive with still fiercer animosity for the prize of power. Ebroin, the apostate, another Julian, cast off his religion, that is his monastic vows; his free locks again flowed; he returned to the embraces of his wife.<sup>a</sup> By common consent, Thierry III., the youngest of the sons of Clovis II., brother of Clotaire and of Chilperic, who had been imprisoned in the abbey of St. Denys, if not tonsured, to incapacitate him from the throne, was brought forth to act the part of king. Ebroin aspired to and succeeded in wresting the mayoralty from Leudes, the rival set up by the Bishop of Autun.

No long time elapsed; the bishop is besieged in his cathedral city, and Autun boldly defies, under the command of her bishop, the kingly power, Ebroin ruling in the name of King Thierry III. Leodegar found it necessary to capitulate: he made his capitulation wear the appearance of lofty religious sacrifice; but he escaped not the revenge of Ebroin, who scrupled not to abuse his victory with the most atrocious barbarities against the holy person of the bishop. His eyes were pierced, his lips cloven, his tongue cut out. Two years after (he had taken refuge or had been consigned a prisoner to the abbey of Fecamp) he was cruelly put to death. He became a martyr as well as a saint in the annals of the Church—a martyr in the calm and majestic patience with which he submitted to his sufferings:—but a martyr to what Christian truth? To what but the power of the clergy, or to his own power, it is difficult to say.<sup>b</sup> Ere long he became the most

<sup>a</sup> The poet naturally describes this enforced monachism as the unforgiven crime, which caused the insatiable vindictiveness of Ebroin:—

"*Illum propter, compulsus sum perdere crinem,  
Depulsus regno, monachalem sumere formam,  
Conjugis amplexus dulces et basia liqui,  
Oscula nec prolis collo suspensa tenebam.*"

*Pitra*, p. 477.

<sup>b</sup> Compare (it is neither unamusing nor uninstructional) the *Vie de S. Leger*,

par le R. P. Dom. J. B. Pitra, Paris, 1846. The author has ingeniously interwoven into one all the legends of the period, with much of the patient industry and copious erudition, and with the devout feelings, the prejudices (we must pardon some little of the bitterness of later times) of his spiritual ancestors of St. Maur. M. Pitra looks back with fond reverence to the times when bishops ruled sole and supreme in their

powerful and popular saint of his prolific age; his relics were disputed by cities, submitted to the ordeal of the divine judgment; distant churches boasted some limb of the holy martyr, his miracles were numberless, and even in the nineteenth century petitions are made for some of the wonder-working bones of St. Leger.<sup>1</sup>

The policy by which Ebroin, the mayor of the palace, retained his power—the depression of the higher nobles, the elevation of the lower—belongs to the history of France, not to that of Christianity. What the higher nobility and some of the bishops called rebellious tyranny, his partisans held to be high and rigid justice; yet Ebroin had in his party some of the most holy bishops: saint balanced saint.<sup>k</sup> St. Genesius of Lyons, St. Leger, were his enemies; one his victim. In his party were St. Præjectus (St. Prie) of Auvergne, St. Reol of Rheims, St. Agilbert of Paris, St. Ouen of Rouen.<sup>l</sup> A council of bishops sat in judgment on St. Leger, at Marli, near Paris: it is difficult to believe that they were not consenting to his death.<sup>m</sup>

But Ebroin bore no charmed life: less than a charmed life in those times could not hope duration, not even to attain to good old age. Once he baffled a formidable insurrection; and with the aid of two prelates (Reol, metropolitan of Rheims, and Agilbert of Paris) cut off Martin, one of the grandsons of Pepin the Great, of Landon, who with his brother Pepin aspired to the mayoralty at least of Austrasia. The bishops swore upon certain relics that

cities; when grants of counties were lavished on monasteries; when monastic admiration for monastic virtues created saints by hundreds; when miracle was almost the law, not the exception, in nature. M. Pitra believes that he believes all the supernatural stories of those times, and that with a kind of earnestness differing much from the bravado of belief avouched by some other kindred writers. The Life of St. Leger is in truth an excellent religious romance; but, even in these days, will not pass for history in the literature which still boasts the living names of Guizot, the Thierry's, C. Remusat, Ampère, and their rising scholars.

<sup>1</sup> See in Pitra, p. 439, the letter from

the curé of Evreuil (dated Oct. 4, 1833) to the Bishop of Autun. Conceive such a letter addressed to the Bishop of Autun of the days of the republic!

<sup>k</sup> "Mulciber in Trojam, pro Troja stabat Apollo, Equa Venus Teucris, Pallas iniqua fuit."

<sup>l</sup> On one occasion, it is said, Ebroin consulted S. Ouen. "Remember Fredegonde," replied the bishop. Ebroin was wise, and understood at once. Fredegonde the example urged by a saint!—*Gesta Francorum*.

<sup>m</sup> "Et cum diu flagitantes," the Synod with Ebroin, "non valuissent elicere—ejus tunicam considerunt a capite,"—a degradation, previous to death, performed by ecclesiastics.—Apud Bouquet.

Martin's life should be secure, but they had withdrawn the holy witnesses, and swore on the empty case." These bishops, afterwards saints, at least did not protest against the death of the deluded youth. Ebroin himself perished by the blow of an assassin—perished not in this world only. A monk on the shores of the Saône, who had been blinded by Ebroin, heard a boat rowed furiously down the stream. A terrible voice thundered out, "It is Ebroin whom we are bearing to the cauldron of hell."<sup>o</sup>

Pepin the Short, the heir of Pepin the Great of Landon (whose daughter had married the son of the famous Arnulf of Metz), rose to the mayoralty, first in one kingdom, at length in the whole of France. Under his vigorous administration France resumed her unity: it ceased to be a theocracy. The bishops retired, it is feared not to their holier offices. Councils, which had been as frequent as diets or malls, ceased. As it ever has been, the enormous wealth and power accumulated by saints, or reputed saints, worked their inevitable consequences. They corrupted their masters, and tempted violent and unworthy men to usurp the high places of the Church. Those who boast the saints, the splendid monasteries, the noble foundations, the virtues, the continence, the wonders of the former generation, as bitterly lament the degradation, the worldliness, the vices, the drunkenness, licentiousness, marriage or concubinage of the succeeding race. It was this state of the clergy which moved the indignation and contempt of St. Boniface, and which the Pope himself hoped to constrain by the holy influence of the German missionary prelate and by the power of Charles Martel.<sup>p</sup>

Such then was the clergy of France, when Charles Martel, after a furious conflict, won the inheritance of his father, Pepin the Short—the mayoralty of France. Even from

<sup>n</sup> "Nuntios dirigit, Ægilbertum et Reolum Remensis urbis Episcopum, ut fide promissâ in incertum super vacuas capsas sacramenta falsa dederint. Qua in re ille credens eos ac Lugduno-Clavato cum sodalibus ac sociis ad Erchrecum veniens, illic cum suis omnibus interfectus est."—Fredegar. Contin., apud Bouquet, ii. p. 451.

<sup>o</sup> Adonis Chron. apud Bouquet, ii. p. 670.

<sup>p</sup> "Quidem affirmant (quod plurimum populo nocet) homicidas vel adulteros in ipsis sceleribus perseverantes, fieri tamen posse sacerdotes." So writes Boniface at the court of Charles Martel.—Epist. xii., Giles, i. p. 36. Compare letter to Pope Zacharias, especially on the lives of certain deacons (Epist. xlv.), and the answer of Zacharias.

his birth the clergy had been adverse to Charles. He was the son of Pepin, by Alpaide, whom, in the freedom of royal polygamy, he had married during the lifetime of his former wife, Plectruda. The clergy, not without ground, denied the legitimacy of Charles. Already his patrimony, the royal revenues, being exhausted by his strife for the Mayoralty, Charles had not scrupled to lay his hands on the vast, tempting, misused wealth of the hierarchy.

Erelong, on this kingdom—of which more than one-half of the nobility were bishops or abbots, of which a very large proportion, no doubt the best cultivated and richest land, was in the hands of the monks and clergy—burst the invasion of the unbelieving Saracens. The crescent waved over Narbonne and the cities of the south; churches and monasteries were effaced from the soil. How terrible, how perilous was that invasion, one fact may witness. Autun, in the centre of Burgundy, the city of St. Leger, with all its Gaulish, Roman, Burgundian, hierarchical, monastic splendour, was captured and utterly laid waste. The hierarchy fought not themselves, though the Bishop of Sens did gallantly, and in arms, defend his city. Charles would not be content with the barren aid of their prayers: his exactions, his seizure of their possessions, which they held only through his valour, they still branded as impious and sacrilegious robberies.<sup>a</sup> Hence the extraordinary contradiction:—while the Pope sees in Charles Martel only the conqueror of the Saracens at Poitiers, only the great transalpine power which may control the hated Lombards, the hero of Christendom, the orthodox sovereign; with the hierarchy of France Charles is a Belshazzar who has laid his unhallowed hands on the treasures of the Church, a sacrilegious tyrant doomed to everlasting perdition.

---

<sup>a</sup> Compare M. Guizot's (*Essais*, xiv.) Charles Martel seized and redistributed suggestions as to the mode in which church property to his warriors.

## CHAPTER XI.

## PEPIN, KING OF FRANCE.

BUT whatever might have been the result of the negotiations between the Pope and Charles Martel, they were interrupted by the death of the two contracting parties. Charles Martel and Gregory III. died within a month of each other.\*

Zacharias, a Greek, succeeded to Gregory III. At his election even the form of obtaining the consent of the Exarch, as representative of the Eastern emperor, was discarded for ever. The death of Charles Martel, which weakened his power by dividing it between his sons Carloman and Pepin, left the Pope at the mercy of Liutprand. The exarchate, the Roman territory, Rome itself, was utterly defenceless against the Lombard, exasperated, as he might justly be, at this attempt to mingle up a Transalpine power in the affairs of Italy. At the time of Gregory's death there seems to have been a suspension of hostilities, attributed, though with no historical authority, to the remonstrances or menaces of Charles Martel. But now the terror even of the name of Charles was withdrawn, the Pope had no protection but in the sanctity of his office. He sent an embassy to Liutprand, who received it with courtesy and respect, granted advantageous terms of peace to the dukedom or territory of Rome, and promised to restore Ameria and the other cities which he had seized from the Roman territory. Liutprand inexorably demanded that the Pope should abandon the cause of the rebellious Duke of Spoleto. Thrasimund was compelled to submit: he was deposed, and retired into a monastery. Liutprand appointed a more obedient vassal, his own

Pope Zacharias, Dec. 741.

\* Baronius inclines to the damnation of Charles; at least, ascribes his death to his tardiness in not marching to the Pope's succour. How came the Pope to

die also at this critical time? Charles Martel died A.D. 741, Oct. 21; Gregory III., Nov. 27.

nephew, a dangerous neighbour to Rome, to the dukedom. But Liutprand delayed the restoration of the four cities: his armies still occupied the midland regions of Italy.

The independence of Rome was on the hazard: Italy was again on the verge of becoming a Lombard kingdom. The future destinies of Europe were trembling in the balance. Had the whole of Italy, at least to the borders of Naples (Naples, and even Sicily, could easily have been wrested from the Greek empire), been consolidated under one hereditary rule, and had the Pope sunk back to his spiritual functions, Pepin and his more powerful successor, Charlemagne, might not have been invited into Italy as protectors of the liberties and religion of Rome.

The course of Lombard conquest was arrested by the personal weight and sacerdotal awe which environed the Pope. Since the time of Leo the Great, no pontiff placed such bold reliance on his priestly character and on himself as Zacharias. Other Popes had not mingled in the active life of man with man. They had officiated in the churches, presided in councils of ecclesiastics, issued decrees, administered their temporal affairs through their officers or legates. Zacharias seemed to delight in encountering his most dangerous enemies face to face: he was his own ambassador. Zacharias no doubt knew the character of the Lombard king. With all his ambition and warlike activity, Liutprand, if we are to believe the Lombard historian, blended the love of peace and profound piety. He was renowned for his chastity, his fervency in prayer, his liberality in alms-giving. He was illiterate, yet to be equalled with the sagest philosophers.<sup>b</sup> The strength and the weakness of such a character were equally open to impressions from the apostolic majesty, perhaps the apostolic gentleness, of the head of Christendom.

The spiritual potentate set forth in his peaceful array, surrounded by his court of bishops, to the camp of Liutprand near Terni. He was met at Cor-  
Interview with Liutprand at Terni. A.D. 742. tona by Grimoald, an officer of Liutprand's court, conducted first to Narni, afterwards with great pomp,

<sup>b</sup> "Custus, pudicus, orator pervigil, ignarus, sed philosophis æquandus."—*eleemosynis largus, literarum quidem Paul. Diac.*

accompanied by part of the army and by the Lombard nobility, to Terni.<sup>c</sup> The scene of the interview was a church—that of St. Valentine; the Pope thus availing himself of the awfulness by which a religious mind like that of Liutprand would in such a place be already half prostrated before his holy antagonist. There he would listen with deeper emotion to the appalling admonitions of the pontiff on the vanity of earthly grandeur. The Lombard was reminded of the strict, it might be speedy, account which he was to give to God, in whose presence he stood, of all the blood which he had shed in war. He was threatened with eternal damnation if he delayed to surrender the four cities, according to his stipulations.

The issue of such a contest could not be doubtful. The appalled Barbarian yielded at once. He declared that he restored the four cities to St. Peter. His <sup>Treaty of peace.</sup> generous piety knew no bounds. He gave back all the estates of the Church in the Sabine country, which the Lombards had held for thirty years—Narni, Osino, Ancona, and towns in the district of Sutri—released unransomed all the Roman prisoners taken in the war, and concluded a peace for twenty years with the dukedom of Rome. The treaty was ratified by a solemn service, at which the Pope (the bishopric of Terni being vacant) officiated; the pious king, the officers of his court and army, attended in submissive reverence. The Pope then entertained him with a great banquet,<sup>d</sup> and returned to Rome. The deliverer of the city from a foreign yoke was received with a religious ovation, as well deserved as one of the Triumphs of older days. The procession passed from the ancient Pantheon, now the church of St. Mary ad Martyres, to St. Peter's.

Yet beyond the immediate circle of the pontiff's magic influence, Liutprand could not resist the temptation offered by the wreck of the defenceless exarchate. Though, according to his treaty with the Pope, he respected the territory of Rome, he suddenly surprised Cesena, and announced his determination to subdue the rest of the

<sup>c</sup> Anastas. in Vit. Zachariæ.

<sup>d</sup> "Ubi cum tanta suavitate esum sumpsit, et cum tantâ hilaritate cordis,

ut diceret rex tantum se nunquam meminisse comessatum."—Vit. Zachar.

exarchate. Ravenna already beheld the formidable conqueror before her walls. The only refuge was in the unarmed Pope. Eutychius the Exarch, the archbishop, the people of the city and of the province joined in an earnest petition for the intervention of the pontiff. Zacharias espoused their cause; he sent an embassy to Pavia to dissuade Liutprand from further aggression, and to request the restoration of Cesena. The Lombard refused to receive the ambassadors. The unbaffled Pope determined once more to try the effect of his personal presence: he

Second interview at Pavia  
A.D. 743.

set forth in state towards Pavia. The importance attached to this journey is attested by the miracles with which it was invested. A cloud, by the special interposition of St. Peter, hovered constantly over the sacred band, to shield them from the violent heats, till they pitched their tents in the evening. At some distance from Ravenna he was met by the Exarch; and, still overshadowed by the faithful cloud, which poised itself at length over one of the churches, he entered the city. He left it followed by the whole population, men and women, in tears, praying for the good pastor who had left his own flock for their protection. A new sign, like a fiery army in the heavens, marshalled him on his way towards Pavia. But he derived greater advantage from other guidance. He had sent forward some of his attendants to Imola, on the Lombard border, from whom he received intelligence of orders issued to stop him on his march. The Pope made a rapid journey and reached the Po. On the banks he was met by some of the Lombard nobles, whom the king, having in vain attempted to elude the reception of the embassy, sent to receive him with due honours. After the arrival at Pavia, a few days were passed in religious ceremonies, at which the king attended with his wonted devotion. It was St. Peter's day; a day happily chosen for the august ceremony. At length Liutprand consented

June 29.

to admit the pontiff to an interview in his palace. After long and resolute resistance on the king's part, Zacharias extorted the abandonment of his ambitious designs on the exarchate, the restoration of two-thirds of the territory of Cesena.

Thus for a short time longer the wreck of the imperial dominion in Italy was preserved by the sole influence, the religious eloquence and authority, of the unarmed Bishop of Rome. But such was the power of religion in those times, that not merely did it enable the clergy to dictate their policy to armed and powerful sovereigns, to arrest Barbarian invasion, and to snatch, as it were, conquests already in their rapacious hands; in every quarter of Western Europe kings were seen abdicating their thrones, placing themselves at the feet of the Pope as humble penitents, casting off their pomp, and submitting to the privations and the discipline of monks.

It has been related that when Columban, some years before, endeavoured to persuade the Merovingian Theodebert to abandon his throne and become an ecclesiastic, the whole assembly burst out into scornful laughter.\* “Was it ever heard that a Merovingian king had degraded himself into a priest?” The saint had replied, “He who disdains to become an ecclesiastic will become so against his will.” The times had rapidly changed. From all parts of Western Christendom kings were coming, lowly penitents, to Rome, to lay aside the vain pomp of royalty, to assume the coarse attire, the total seclusion, and, as they hoped, the undisturbed and heaven-winning peace of the cloister. Ceolwulf is said to have been the eighth Anglo-Saxon prince who became a monk. Now, within a few years, from the thrones of France and of Lombardy, the kings descended of their own accord, and laid their temporal government down before the head of Christendom, and entreated permission to devote the rest of their lives to the spiritual state.

Carloman, the elder son of Charles Martel, had commenced his reign with vigour, ability, and success. On a sudden he cast off at once the duties and the dignity of his station,<sup>f</sup> and surrendered to Pepin, his brother, the power

\* “Dicebant enim nunquam se audivisse Merovingum in regno sublimatum, voluntarium clericum fuisse. *Detestantibus ergo omnibus.*”—Vit. Columbani.

<sup>f</sup> Carloman had been preceded in this course by Hunald, Duke of Aquitaine, who having treacherously lured his

brother Atto from the strong city of Poitiers, blinded him, and a few days after shut himself up in a monastery in the isle of Rhé.—H. Martin, *Histoire de France*, ii. p. 301. Hunald, however, on the death of his son, twenty-five years afterwards, scandalised Christendom by

and all the ambitious hopes of his family. Carloman left his country, appeared in Italy, humbly requested to be admitted into the monastic state, built a monastery on Mount Soracte, but finding that too near to Rome, retired to the more profound seclusion of Monte Casino. In that solitude the heir of Charles Martel hoped to pass the rest of his earthly days.<sup>5</sup>

But Pope Zacharias beheld even a greater triumph of the faith. A Lombard king suddenly paused on the full tide of ambition and success, and from a deadly and formidable enemy of the Pope and of the Roman interest, became a peaceful monk.<sup>6</sup>

During the year of his last interview with Pope Zacharias had died Liutprand, the ablest and mightiest of the Lombard kings. Notwithstanding his pious deference for the Pope, his munificent ecclesiastical foundations in all parts of his dominions, the papal biographer attributes his death to the prayers of the Pope and the direct intervention of St. Peter.<sup>1</sup> The burthen of ingratitude need not be laid on the Pope on account of the mature death of a sovereign who had reigned for thirty years.

A.D. 713-743.

During a dangerous illness of Liutprand, nine years before, his nephew Hildebrand had been associated with him in the kingdom. After seven months of his sole dominion Hildebrand was deposed by the unanimous suffrage of the nation, and Rachis, Duke of Friuli, was raised to the throne. The first act of Rachis was to confirm the peace of twenty years with the Pope. The truce with the exarchate expired in the fifth year of his reign. But suddenly, incensed by some unknown cause of offence,

A.D. 749.  
Rachis.

or in a fit of ambition, Rachis appeared in arms, broke into the exarchate, and invested Perugia. The indefatigable Pope delayed not his interference. Again he was his own ambassador, and appeared in the camp of the Lombard king.<sup>2</sup> But he was not content with

returning to the world, and resuming not only his dominions, but his wife also. —Muratori, *Ann. d'Italia*, sub ann. 747.

<sup>5</sup> Vit. Zachariæ. *Chronic. Moissiac.* apud Pertz, i. 292.

<sup>6</sup> Pauli i. *Epist. ad Pepin. Regem*; Muratori, *R. I. Scrip.* iii. 11. 116.

<sup>1</sup> Anastasius in Zacharia.

<sup>2</sup> *Chronic. Salernit.* i. 1; apud Muratori, i. 2. . . "Impensis eidem regi plurimis muneribus, atque . . . deprecans." See also account of conversion of King Rachis.

compelling King Rachis to break up the siege ; he pressed him so strongly with his saintly arguments, perhaps with the holy example of Carloman, that in a few days the king stood before the gates of Rome with his wife and daughter, having abdicated his throne, an humble suppliant for admission into the cloister. He too retired to Monte Casino, which thus boasted of two royal recluses. His wife and daughter entered the neighbouring convent of Piombaruola. Carloman will appear again, somewhat unexpectedly, on the scene of political life.

Rachis a monk.

A.D. 749.

The last act in the eventful pontificate of Zacharias was the most pregnant with important results to Latin Christendom, the transference of the crown of France from the Merovingian line to the father of Charlemagne, with the sanction, it has been asserted, under the direct authority, of the Pope. To the Church and to Western Europe it is difficult to estimate all the consequences of the elevation of the Carlovingian dynasty.

A.D. 751.

Pepin, king of France.

The Pope has been accused of assuming an unwarranted power in virtually, as it were, by his sanction of Pepin's coronation, absolving the subjects of Chilperic from their allegiance ; of want of stern principle in countenancing the violation of the great law of hereditary succession, and the rebellious ambition of the Mayor of the Palace, who thus degraded his lawful sovereign and usurped his throne. This is to confound the laws and usages of different ages. Hereditary succession among the Teutonic races had not yet attained that sanctity in which, in later times, it has been invested by supposed religious authority, and the rational persuasion of its inestimable advantage. In theory it was admitted in the Roman empire ; but the perpetual change of dynasty at Constantinople was not calculated to confirm the general reverence for its inviolability. Among the Lombards, as in most of the Gothic kingdoms, the nobles claimed and constantly exercised the privilege of throwing off the yoke of an unworthy prince, and advancing a more warlike or able chieftain, usually of the royal race, to the throne. The degradation of the successor to Liut-

prand, the accession of Rachis, were yet fresh in the memory of man. The Teutonic sovereign was still in theory the leader of an army; when he ceased to exercise his primary functions he had almost abdicated his state. It is difficult to conceive how such a shadow of a monarch had been so long permitted to rule over an enterprising and turbulent nation like the Franks. He was more like the Lama of an old, decrepit, Asiatic theocracy than the head of a young and conquering people. He sat on a throne with long hair and a flowing beard (these were the signs of royalty, worn indiscriminately whether he was young or old), he received ambassadors, and gave the answers put into his mouth: he had no domain but one small city, whose revenues hardly maintained his scanty retinue. In the spring alone, at the opening of the Champ de Mars, the idol was drawn forth from his sanctuary and offered to the sight of the people. He was slowly conveyed in a car drawn by oxen through the ranks of his wondering subjects, and was then consigned again to his secluded state.<sup>m</sup> For two or three generations the effete Merovingian race had acquiesced in this despicable inactivity, and made no effort to break forth from the ignominious pomp in which they slumbered away their lives.

There are no details of this signal revolution.<sup>n</sup> Pepin sent two ecclesiastics, Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, and Fulrad his chaplain, to consult the Pope, but it appears not whether to relieve his conscience or as to a judge of recognised authority. A less decided pontiff than Zacharias might think the nation justified in its weariness of that hypocrisy which assigned to a secluded, imbecile pageant the name and ensigns of royalty, while its power was possessed by his Mayor of the Palace. It was time to put an end to this poor comedy of monarchy. Even if he took a higher view of his own power, there was full precedent in that which had long been the code of hierarchical privilege, the Old Testament, for the

<sup>m</sup> "Crine profuso, barbâ submissa . . . quocunque eundum erat, carpento ibat, bubulis rustico more agente trahebatur." Eginhard, c. 1. Compare Michelet, Hist. de France. Eginhard may perhaps

have exaggerated the absolute and ostentatious insignificance of the dethroned Merovingian.

<sup>n</sup> Eginhard, Ann. sub ann. 750, 751.

interference of the Priest, of God's representative on earth, in the deposition of unworthy kings, in the elevation of new dynasties.<sup>o</sup> It was indeed to usurp authority over a foreign kingdom, but what kingdom was foreign to the head of Christendom? The retirement of the deposed Chilperic into a monastery made but little change in his life; he was spared the fatigue and mockery of a public exhibition. The election of Pepin at Soissons was conducted according to the old usage of the Franks, the acclamation and clash of arms of the nobles and of the people, the elevation on the buckler; but it had now a new religious character, which marked the growing power of the clergy. The bishops stood around the throne, as of equal rank with the armed nobles. The Jewish ceremony of anointing was first introduced to sanctify a king perhaps of still somewhat doubtful title. The holy oil was poured on his head by the saintly archbishop of Mentz.<sup>p</sup> Two years after, on the visit of Pope Stephen, this ceremony was renewed by the august head of Christendom. King Chilperic was shaven and dismissed into a monastery, the retreat or the prison of all weary or troublesome princes.<sup>q</sup>

March,  
A.D. 752.

Little foresaw Pepin, little foresaw Zacharias, or his successor Stephen, the effects of the precedent which they were furnishing in the contemptuous dismissal of the poor

<sup>o</sup> "Et Zacharias Papa mandavit Pepino, ut melius esset illum regem vocari, qui potestatem haberet, quam illum, qui sine regali potestate manebat, ut non conturbaretur ordo."—Annal. Franc. apud Duschene. Compare the *Gesta Francorum*, where it is more fully stated (Bouquet, p. 38). This passage is quoted in Lehuierou (*Histoire des Institutions Carolingiennes*, p. 99): "Gens Merovingorum de qua Franci reges sibi creare soliti erant, usque in Hildericum regem; qui jussu Stephani, Romani Pontificis, depositus ac detonsus atque in monasterium trusus est, durasse putatur. Quam licet in illo finita possit videri, tamen jamdudum nullius vigoris erat, nec quicquam in se clarum præter inane regis vocabulum præferbat, nam et opes et potentia regni penes palatii præfectos, qui majores domus dicebantur et ad quos summa imperii pertinebat, tenebantur. . . Qui honor non aliis a populo dari con-

sueverat, quam qui his et claritate generis et opum amplitudine cæteris eminebant."—Eginhard, *Vit. Kar.*, iii. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Clovis had also been anointed by S. Remi: "Elegi baptizari . . . et per ejusdem sacri chris-matis unctionem ordinato in regem . . . statuo." If he fails in his engagements "fiant dies ejus pauci, et principatum ejus accipiat alter."—Testament. S. Remig. ap. Flodoard. On the sacred character conferred by the holy unction, see Adlocutio duorum Episcoporum in eccles. S. Medard, A.D. 806.—Bouquet. According to the bishops, it gave the same right as that divinely bestowed on the kings of Israel. "Ainsi, par une réciprocité ordinaire dans les affaires humaines, le sacre, en donnant un titre, a imposé une sujétion; et de cette équivoque naîtra un jour le plus grand problème du moyen âge, la guerre du sacerdoce et de l'empire."—Lehuierou, p. 330.

<sup>q</sup> Eginhard, *loc. cit.*

foolish Chilperic from the throne of his ancestors, and the sanction of the Pope to this it might seem almost insignificant act : that successors of Zacharias would assert that the kings of France, or rather the emperors, the successors of Charlemagne, held their crown only by the authority of the Pope ; that the Pope might transfer that allegiance, to which the only title was the papal sanction, to a more loyal son of the Church.

In every respect, whether he contemplated the remote or the immediate interests of the Church or of Christianity, the Pope might hail with unmitigated satisfaction and hope the accession of Pepin. The whole race, since the alliance with Charles Martel, had been devoted to the Church and to the see of Rome. The prescient sagacity of Zacharias might discern in Astolph, the new king of the Lombards, that he inherited all the ambition without the strong religious feeling of his predecessors. Rome might speedily need a powerful Transalpine protector.

Nor could the Pope be blind to the pride, the ambition, the duty of establishing his own jurisdiction on a firmer basis beyond the Alps. In the German part of the Frankish kingdom, and in Germany itself, had now arisen a new clergy ; if more devoted to the Pope, unquestionably of far higher Christian character than the degenerate hierarchy of France. They began as the humblest yet most enterprising missionaries, daily perilling their lives for the faith, and bringing gradually tribes of Barbarians within the pale of Christendom ; they had become prelates of large sees, abbots of flourishing monasteries. But all this aggression on paganism, all these conquests of Christianity and civilisation in the forests and morasses of Germany, had been made by men commissioned by Rome, and in strict subserviency to her discipline. Not even the jarring discrepancy between what Boniface and his followers saw and heard of the lives of Christian prelates in Rome, the venality of the public proceedings, and all which was strange to his lofty ideal of the faith, could in the least shake their conscientious devotion to the See of St. Peter.

To judge from the reports of these holy men, the monarchy itself was not more utterly effete and depraved

than the old established clergy of France, which had boasted, in the century before, an hierarchy of saints. With due allowance for the rigidly monastic and celibate notions of Boniface and his disciples, which would induce them to condemn the marriage of the clergy as sternly as the loosest concubinage, there can be no doubt that the Frankish clergy were in general sunk low in character as in estimation.<sup>r</sup> Boniface, well informed, doubtless, of what he might expect to find, demands authority of the Pope to punish by summary degradation the incredible profligacy, especially of the lower ecclesiastics; as well as to interdict the unchristian occupations of the soldier-bishops, who indulged all the license of the camp—drunkenness, gambling, and quarrelling; and all the ferocity of the field of battle, even bloodshed, whether that of Pagans or Christians.<sup>s</sup>

All the energy at least, the high principle, the pure morality, all the Christianity of the time, might seem centred in these missionaries and in their followers; and this clergy at once so much more papal, and of so much higher character, was that of the new Carlovingian kingdom, a kingdom of Germany<sup>t</sup> rather than of Gaul. This clergy, the ancestors of Pepin, and Pepin himself, had always treated with the utmost respect and deference.<sup>u</sup> Boniface, in truth, as Papal Legate, or under the authority of Pepin, had early assumed the power of a primate of Gaul, consecrated three archbishops, of Rouen, and Sens,

<sup>r</sup> Archbishop Boniface, it is said, Archbishop of Mentz, by papal authority (*missus S. Petri*), was set by Charles Martel over a synod, of which the object was to restore the law of God and the religion of the Church, which had gone to ruin under former kings, “*quæ in diebus præteritorum principum corrui*.”—*Epist. Bonifac. Ellendorf die Karolinger*, i. p. 83. Carloman and his brother Pepin had followed the example of their father Charles Martel in supporting with all their power, these better Christian ecclesiastics; they not only befriended them in their conversion of the Pagans, but in the correction of their own clergy.

<sup>s</sup> Bonifac. *Epist.*, with the permission to hold the Synod, and the reply of Pope Zacharias.—*Labbe, Concil.*, p.

1495. He speaks of those who “*in diaconatu concubinas quatuor vel quinque vel plures noctu in lectulo habentes*,” nevertheless dared to perform their sacred offices, and were promoted to the priesthood, even to episcopacy. He proceeds: “*Et inveniantur quidam inter eos episcopi, qui licet dicant se fornicarios vel adulteros non esse, sunt tamen ebriosi, et injuriosi, vel pugnatōres; et qui pugnant in exercitu armati, et effundunt propriâ manu sanguinem hominum sive infidelium, sive Christianorum*.”

<sup>t</sup> Compare Guizot, *Essai* iii.

<sup>u</sup> Pope Zacharias writes to Boniface: “*Quod (Carlomanus et Pepinus) tuæ prædicationis socii et adjutores esse niterentur ex divina inspiratura*.”—*Epist. Bonifac.*, 144.

and Rheims. The last see was occupied by a soldier-prelate, named Milo, archbishop at once of Rheims and of Treves, who resisted for ten years all attempts to dispossess him; at the end of that time he was killed by a wild boar.

King Pepin was himself an Austrasian, the vast estates of his family lay on the Rhine. The accession of his house Teutonised more completely, till the division among the sons of Charlemagne, the whole Frankish monarchy.

Pope Zacharias did not live to behold the fulfilment of his great designs. He died in the same year on which Pepin became King of France. The election fell on a certain presbyter, named Stephen; but the third day after, before his consecration, he was seized with a fit, and died the following day. He is not reckoned in the line of popes. Another Stephen, chosen immediately on his death, is usually called the second of that name.

The first act of Stephen's pontificate was to guard against the threatened aggressions of the Lombards. Already had Astolph, a prince as daring but less religious than Liutprand, entered the Exarchate, and seized Ravenna. The ambassadors of the Pope were received with courtesy, his gifts with avidity; a hollow truce for forty years was agreed on; but in four months (the terms of the treaty, and the pretext alleged by Astolph for its violation, are equally unknown) the Lombard was again in arms. In terms of contumely and menace he demanded the instant submission of Rome, and the payment of a heavy personal tribute, a poll-tax on each citizen. Astolph now treated the ambassadors of the Pope with scorn.\* A representative of the empire, which still clung to its barren rights in Italy, John the Silentiary, appeared at Rome. He was sent to Ravenna, to protest against the Lombard invasion, and to demand the restoration of the Roman territory of the republic. Astolph dismissed him with a civil but evasive answer,

\* According to Anastasius, he was required to surrender to their rightful lord all that he had usurped by his *diabolic* ambition. This is a flower of ecclesiastical rhetoric, yet showing the papal abhorrence of the Lombards.

that he would send an ambassador to the Emperor. Stephen wrote to Constantinople, that without an army to back the imperial demands, all was lost.

October.

Astolph, exasperated, perhaps, at the demand of an army from the East, which might reach his ears, inflexibly pursued his advantages. He approached the Roman frontier; he approached Rome. Not all the litanies, not all the solemn processions to the most revered altars of the city, in which the Pope himself, with naked feet, bore the cross, and the whole people followed with ashes on their heads, and with a wild howl of agony implored the protection of God against the blaspheming Lombards, arrested for an instant his progress. The Pope appealed to heaven, by tying a copy of the treaty, violated by Astolph, to the holy cross.<sup>7</sup> Yet, during the siege of Rome, Astolph was digging up the bodies of saints, not for insult, but as the most precious trophies, and carried them off as tutelar deities to Lombardy.<sup>8</sup>

The only succour was beyond the Alps, from Pepin, the king, by papal sanction, of the Catholic Franks. Already the Pope had written to beseech the interference of the Transalpine; and now, as the danger became more imminent, he determined to leave his be-  
Stephen leaves Rome.  
 loved flock, though in a feeble state of health, to encounter the perils of a journey over the Alps, and so to visit the Barbarian monarch in person. He set forth among the tears and lamentations of the people. He was accompanied by some ecclesiastics, by the Frankish bishop Radigond, and the Duke Anscharis, already sent by Pepin to invite him to the court of France. Miracles, now the ordinary signs of a papal progress, were said to mark his course.<sup>9</sup> Instead of endeavouring to

Oct. 14.

<sup>7</sup> "Alligans connectensque adorandæ cruci Dei nostri, pactum illud, quod nefandus Rex Longobardorum dirupit."—Anastas., in Vit. Steph. ii.

<sup>8</sup> "Ablata multa sanctorum corpora ex Romanis finibus, in Papiam . . . construxit eorum oracula." He founded a nunnery, in which he placed his own daughters.—Chronic. Salernit.

<sup>9</sup> Compare, on the other hand, the curious story in Agnelli. Stephen wished

to plunder on his way the treasures of the church of Ravenna. The Ravennese priests (among them Leo, afterwards archbishop) designed to murder him. He escaped, taking only part of the treasures. Those who had plotted the death of the Pope were sent to Rome, and remained till most of them died. Among them, says the writer, "avus patris mei fuit."—Apud Muratori.

pass without observation through the Lombard dominions, he boldly presented himself at the gate of Pavia. He was disappointed if he expected Astolph to be overawed by his presence, as Liutprand and Rachis had been by that of

his saintly predecessor ; but he was safe under the protection of the ambassador of Pepin. Astolph received him not without courtesy, accepted his gifts, but paid no regard to his earnest tears and supplications ; coldly rejected his exorbitant demands,—the immediate restoration of all the Lombard conquests—but respected his person, and tried only, by repeated persuasion, to divert him from his journey into France. Stephen, on leaving Pavia, anticipated any stronger measures to detain him

by a rapid march to the foot of the Alps. In November he passed the French frontier, and reached the convent of St. Maurice. There he was met by another ecclesiastic, and another noble of the highest rank, with orders to conduct him to the court. At a distance of a hundred miles from the court appeared the

Prince Charles, with some chosen nobles. Charles was thus to be early impressed with reverence for the Papal dignity. Three miles from the palace of Pontyon,<sup>b</sup> Pepin came forth with his wife, his family, and the rest of his feudatories. As the Pope approached, the king dismounted from his horse, and prostrated himself on the ground before him. He then walked by the side of the Pope's palfrey. The Pope and the ecclesiastics broke out at once into hymns of thanksgiving, and so chaunting as they went, reached the royal residence. Stephen lost no time in adverting to the object of his visit. He implored the immediate<sup>c</sup> interposition of Pepin to enforce the restoration of the domain of St. Peter. So relate the Italians. According to the French chroniclers, the Pope and his clergy, with ashes on their heads, and sackcloth on their bodies, prostrated themselves as suppliants at the feet of Pepin, and would not rise till he had promised his aid against the perfidious Lombard. Pepin swore at once to fulfill all the requests of the Pope ; but as the winter rendered military operations impracticable,

<sup>b</sup> Pontyon on the Perche, near Vitry-le-brulé.

invited him to Paris, where he took up his residence in the abbey of St. Denys. Pepin and his two sons were again anointed by the Pope himself, their sovereignty thus more profoundly sanctified in the minds of their subjects. Stephen would secure the perpetuity of the dynasty under pain of interdict and excommunication. The nation was never to presume to choose a king in future ages, but of the race of Charles Martel.\* From fatigue and the severity of the climate, Stephen became dangerously ill in the monastery of St. Denys, but, after a hard struggle, recovered his health. His restoration was esteemed a miracle, wrought July. through the prayers of St. Denys, St. Peter, and St. Paul.

Astolph, in the mean time, did not disdain the storm which was brooding beyond the Alps. He took an extraordinary measure to avert the danger. He persuaded Carloman, the brother of Pepin, who had abdicated his throne, and turned monk, to leave his monastery, to cross the Alps, and endeavour to break this close alliance between Pepin and the Pope. No wonder that the clergy should attribute the influence of Astolph over the mind of Carloman to diabolic arts, for Carloman appeared at least, whether seized by an access of reviving ambition, or incensed at Pepin's harsh treatment of his family, to enter with the utmost zeal into the cause of the Lombard. The humble slave of the Pope Zacharias presented himself in France as the resolute antagonist of Pope Stephen and of the Papal cause.<sup>b</sup> But the throne of Pepin Carloman in France. was too firmly fixed; he turned a deaf and contemptuous ear to his brother's arguments. The Pope asserted his authority over the renegade monk, who had broken his vows: and Carloman was imprisoned for life in a cloister at Vienne; that life, however, lasted but a few days.

\* "Tali omnes interdicto et excommunicationis lege constrinxit, ut nunquam de alterius lumbis regem in ævo præsumerent eligere."—Clausul. de Pipini Elect.

<sup>b</sup> According to Anastasius, "vehementius decertabat, sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ causam subvertere." It is impossible to conceive how Astolph could per-

suaude him to engage in this strange and perilous mission, and the arguments urged by Carloman on his brother are still more strange. Eginhard asserts that he came "jussu abbatis sui quia nec ille abbas sui jussa contempnere, nec abbas ille præceptis Regis Longobardorum, qui ei et hoc imperavit, audebat resistere." Sub ann. 753.

Pope Stephen was anxious to avert the shedding of blood in the impending war.<sup>c</sup> Thrice before he collected his forces, once on his march to Italy, Pepin sent ambassadors to the Lombard king, who were to exhort him to surrender peaceably the possessions of the Church and of the Roman Republic. Pope Stephen tried the persuasiveness of religious awe. Astolph rejected the menacing and more quiet overtures with scorn, and fell on an advanced post of the Franks, which occupied one of the passes of the Alps, about to be entered by the army. He was routed by those few troops, and took refuge in Pavia. The King of the Franks and Pope Stephen advanced to the walls of the city; and Astolph was glad to purchase an ignominious peace, by pledging himself, on oath, to restore the territory of Rome.<sup>d</sup>

Pepin in  
Italy.

Sept.—Oct.

Pepin had no sooner retired beyond the Alps with his hostages, than Astolph began to find causes to delay the covenanted surrender. After a certain time he marched with his whole forces upon Rome, to which Pope Stephen had then returned, wasted the surrounding country, encamped before the Salarian Gate, and demanded the surrender of the Pope.<sup>e</sup> The plunder, if the Papal historian is to be believed, which he chiefly coveted, was the dead bodies of the saints. These he dug up and carried away. He demanded that the Romans should give up the Pope into his hands, and on these terms only would he spare the city. Astolph declared he would not leave the Pope a foot of land.<sup>f</sup>

November.

December.  
Siege of  
Rome.

Stephen sent messengers in all haste by sea, for every way by land was closed to his faithful ally. His first letter reminded King Pepin how stern an exacter of promises was St. Peter; "that the king hazarded eternal

Pope Stephen's  
first letter.

<sup>c</sup> "Obtestatur per omnia divina mysteria et futuri examinis diem ut pacifice sine ullâ sanguinis effusione propria sanctæ dei ecclesiæ et reipublicæ Romanorum reddat jura."—Vit. Steph.

<sup>d</sup> The Pope attributed the easy victory of the Franks, not to their valour, but to St. Peter. "Per manum beati Petri Dominus omnipotens victoriam vobis largiri dignatus est."—Steph. Epist. ad Pepin. p. 1632.

<sup>e</sup> Stephan. Epist. Gretser, 261.—"Aperite mihi portam Salariam ut ingrediar civitatem, et tradite mihi pontificem vestrum."

<sup>f</sup> "Nec unius palmi terræ spatium B. Petro . . . vel reipublicæ Romanorum reddere."—Steph. Epist. In the utmost distress, the very stones, the Pope says, might have wept at his grief and peril. —Epist. ad Pepin. Reg.

condemnation if he did not complete the donation which he had vowed to St. Peter, and St. Peter had promised to him eternal life. If the king was not faithful to his word, the apostle had his hand-writing to the grant, which he would produce against him in the day of judgement."

A second letter followed, more pathetic, more persuasive. "Astolph was at the gates of Rome; he threatened, if they did not yield up the Pope, to put the whole city to the sword. He had burned all the villas and the suburbs; <sup>Second letter.</sup> he had not spared the churches; the very altars were plundered and defiled; nuns violated; <sup>Dec. 754—Feb. 755.</sup> infants torn from their mothers' breasts; the mothers polluted;—all the horrors of war were ready to break on the devoted city, which had endured a siege of fifty-five days. He conjured him, by God and his holy mother, by the angels of heaven, by the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and by the last day." This second letter was sent by the hands of the Abbot Warnerius, who had put on his breast-plate, and night and day kept watch for the city. (This is the first example of a warlike abbot.) With him were George, a bishop, and Count Tomaric. Stephen summed up the certain reward which Pepin might expect if he hastened to the rescue—"Victory over all the Barbarian nations, and eternal life."

But the Franks were distant or were tardy; the danger of the Pope and the Roman people more imminent. Stephen was wrought to an agony of fear, and in this state took the daring—to our calmer religious sentiment, impious step—of writing a letter, as from St. Peter <sup>Third from St. Peter himself.</sup> himself, to hasten the lingering succour:—"I, Peter the Apostle, protest, admonish, and conjure you, the Most Christian Kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman, with all the hierarchy, bishops, abbots, priests, and all monks; all judges, dukes, counts, and the whole people of the Franks. The Mother of God likewise adjures you, and admonishes and commands you, she as well as the thrones and dominions, and all the host of heaven, to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards. If ye hasten, I, Peter the Apostle, promise you my protection in this

<sup>6</sup> Epist. ii. ad Pepin. Reg.

life and in the next, will prepare for you the most glorious mansions in heaven, and will bestow on you the everlasting joys of paradise. Make common cause with my people of Rome, and I will grant whatever ye may pray for. I conjure you not to yield up this city to be lacerated and tormented by the Lombards, lest your own souls be lacerated and tormented in hell, with the devil and his pestilential angels. Of all nations under heaven, the Franks are highest in the esteem of St. Peter; to me you owe all your victories. Obey, and obey speedily, and, by my suffrage, our Lord Jesus Christ will give you in this life length of days, security, victory; in the life to come, will multiply his blessings upon you, among his saints and angels."<sup>b</sup>

A vain but natural curiosity would imagine the effect of this letter at the court of Pepin. Were there among his clergy or among his warrior nobles those who really thought they heard the voice of the apostle, and felt that their eternal doom depended on their instant obedience to this appeal? How far was Pepin himself governed by policy or by religious awe? How much was art, how much implicit faith, wrought up to its highest pitch by terror in the mind of the Pope, when the Pope ventured on this awful assumption of the person of the apostle? That he should hazard such a step, having had personal intercourse with Pepin, his clergy, and his nobles, shows the measure which he had taken of the power with which religion possessed their souls. He had fathomed the depths of their Christianity; and whether he himself partook in the same, to us extravagant notions, or used them as lawful instruments to terrify the Barbarians into the protection of the holy see and the advancement of her dominion, he might consider all means justified for such high purposes. If it had been

<sup>b</sup> Gretser, pp. 17-23. Mansi, sub ann. A.D. 755. Fleury observes of this letter: "Au reste, elle est pleine d'équivoques, comme les précédentes. L'Eglise y signifie non l'assemblée des fidèles, mais les biens temporels consacrés à Dieu: le troupeau de Jésus Christ sont les corps et non pas les âmes: les promesses temporelles de l'ancienne loi sont mêlées

avec les spirituelles de l'Evangile, et les motifs plus saints de la religion employés pour une affaire d'état."—Liv. xlvii. c. 17. After all, the ground of quarrel was for the exarchate, not for the estates of the Church. If the Pope had allowed the Lombards to occupy the exarchate, they would have been loyal allies of the Pope.

likely to startle men, by this overwrought demand on their credulity, into reasoning on such subjects, it would have hindered rather than promoted his great end.

Not the least remarkable point of all is, that Christianity has now assumed the complete power, not only of the life to come, but of the present life, with all its temporal advantages. It now leagues itself with Barbarians, not to soften, to civilise, to imbue with devotion, to lead to Christian worship; but to give victory in all their ruthless wars, to confer the blessings of heaven on their schemes of ambition and conquest. The one title to eternal life is obedience to the Church—the Church no longer the community of pious and holy Christians, but the see, almost the city, of Rome: the supreme obligation of man is the protection and enlargement of her domain. By zeal in this cause, without any other moral or religious qualification, the most brutal and bloody soldier is a saint in heaven. St. Peter is become almost God, the giver of victory, the dispenser of eternal life. The time is approaching when war against infidels or enemies of the Pope will be among the most meritorious acts of a Christian.

The Franks had alarmed the Pope by the tardiness of their succour; but their host once assembled and on its march, their rapid movements surprised Astolph. Scarcely could he return to Pavia, when he found himself besieged in his capital. The Lombard forces seem to have been altogether unequal to resist the Franks. Astolph yielded at once to the demands of Pepin, and actually abandoned the whole contested territory. Ambassadors from the East were present at the conclusion of the treaty, and demanded the restitution of Ravenna and its territory to the Byzantine Empire. Pepin declared that his sole object in the war was to show his veneration for St. Peter; and he bestowed, as it seems, by the right of conquest, the whole upon the Pope.

Pepin in  
Italy.  
Lombards  
yield.

The representatives of the Pope, who however always speak of the republic of Rome, passed through the land, receiving the homage of the authorities and the keys of the cities. The district comprehended Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Iesi, Forlimpopoli, Forli

with the Castle Sussibio, Montefeltro, Acerra, Monte di Lucano, Serra, San Marino, Bobbio, Urbino, Cagli, Luciole, Gubbio, Comachio, and Narni which was severed from the dukedom of Spoleto.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the successor, as he was declared, of the fisherman of the Galilean lake, the apostle of Him whose kingdom was not of this world, became a temporal sovereign. By the gift of a foreign potentate, this large part of Italy became the kingdom of the Bishop of Rome.

King Astolph did not long survive this humiliation: he was accidentally killed when hunting. The adherents of the Pope beheld the hand of God in his death; they heap on him every appellation of scorn and hatred; the Pope has no doubt of his damnation.<sup>k</sup>

The Lombards of Tuscany favoured the pretensions of their Duke Desiderius to the throne. In the north of Italy, Rachis, the brother of Astolph, who had retired to a monastery, appeared at the head of a powerful faction, and reclaimed the throne. Desiderius endeavoured to secure the influence of the pope. Stephen extorted, as the price of his interference, Faenza, Imola, with some other castles, and the whole duchy of Ferrara.<sup>m</sup> Stephen no doubt felt a holy horror of the return of a monk to worldly cares, even those of a crown. This would be rank apostasy with him who was thus secularising the papacy itself.

During the later years of Stephen's pontificate, a strong faction had designated his brother Paul as successor to the see. Another party, opposed perhaps to this family transmission of the papacy, which was thus assimilating itself more and more to a temporal sovereignty, set up the claims of the Archdeacon Theophylact. On the vacancy the partisans of Paul prevailed. The brother of Stephen was raised to the throne of St.

A.D. 757.  
April 26.

Paul I. pope.

<sup>1</sup> It is not quite clear how Stephen himself eluded the claims of the Greek Emperor—probably by the Emperor's heresy. In Stephen's letter of thanks for his deliverance to the King of the Franks, he desires to know what answer had been given to the Silentiary, commissioned to assert the rights of his master. He reminds Pepin that he must protect the Catholic Church

against pestilent wickedness (*malitia*), no doubt the iconoclastic opinions of the Emperor, and keep her *property* secure (*omnia proprietatis sue*).

<sup>k</sup> "Divino ictu percussus est et in inferni voraginem demersus."—*Epist. ad Pepin. vi.*; Gretser, 60; Mansi, sub ann.

<sup>m</sup> Perhaps also Osimo, Ancona, Humana, and he even demanded Bologna.

Peter. Paul has the fame of a mild and peace-loving prelate. He loved to wander at night among the hovels of the poor, and to visit the prisons, relieving misery and occasionally releasing the captives from their bondage. Yet is Paul not less involved in the ambitious designs of the advancing papacy. His first act is to announce his election to the King of the Franks, who had now the title, probably bestowed by Stephen, of Patrician of Rome. His letter does not allude to any further ratification of his election, made by the free choice of the clergy and people of Rome; there is no recognition whatever of supremacy.

Desiderius, till he had secured his throne in Lombardy, remained on terms of amity with the Pope; but the old irreconcilable hostility broke out again soon after the accession of Paul.

Among the causes of the weakness of the Lombard kingdom, and the easy triumph of the Franks, was the disunion of the nation. The Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento renounced their allegiance to the King of Pavia, and declared their fealty to the King of the Franks. The chastisement of their revolt gave Desiderius a pretext for war. He marched, ravaging as he went with fire and sword, through the cities of the exarchate, surprised and imprisoned the Duke of Spoleto, forced the Duke of Benevento to take refuge in Otranto, and set up another duke in his place. He then proceeded to Naples, still occupied by the Greeks, and endeavoured to negotiate a dangerous alliance with the Eastern emperor.<sup>a</sup> On his return he passed through Rome; and when the Pope demanded the surrender of the stipulated cities—Imola, Osimo, Ancona, and Bologna—Desiderius eluded the demand by requiring the previous restitution of the Lombard hostages carried by Pepin into France; but dreading perhaps a new Frankish invasion, Desiderius gradually submitted to the fulfilment of his treaty. Disputes arose concerning certain patrimony of the Church in some of the Lombard cities, but even these were amicably adjusted. The adulation of Paul to the King of the Franks passes bounds. He is another Moses: as Moses rescued Israel from the

<sup>a</sup> Gretser, p. 81; Mansi, sub ann. 758.

bondage of Egypt, so Pepin the Catholic Church; as Moses confounded idolatry, so Pepin heresy. The rapturous expressions of the Psalms about the Messiah are scarcely too fervent to be applied to Pepin. All his acts are under divine inspiration.<sup>o</sup> The only apprehensions of Paul seemed to be on the side of the Greeks. On one occasion he writes that six Byzantine ships menaced a descent on Rome; on another he dreads an attack by sea on Ravenna. He entreats the King of the Franks to urge Desiderius to make common cause against the enemy; but he represents the hostility of the Greeks as arising not from their desire to recover their rights in Italy, but solely from the impious design of destroying the images, of subverting the Catholic faith and the traditions of the holy fathers. They are odious iconoclastic heretics, not the Imperial armies warring to regain their lost dominions in Italy. The Greeks have now succeeded to the appellation of "the most wicked," a term hitherto appropriated to the Lombards; but hereafter the epithet of all those who resisted the temporal or spiritual interests of the Papal See.<sup>p</sup>

Such was the singular position of Rome and of the Roman territory. In theory they were still part of the Roman Empire, of which the Greek Emperor, had he been orthodox, would have been the acknowledged sovereign;<sup>q</sup> but his iconoclasm released the members of the true Church from their allegiance: he was virtually or actually under excommunication. In the mean time the right of conquest, and the indefinite title of Patrician, assigned by the Pope, acting in behalf and with the consent of the Roman republic, to Pepin—a title which might be merely honorary, or might justify any authority which he might

<sup>o</sup> Gretzer, *Epist.* xvi. "Novus quippe Moses, novusque David in omnibus operibus suis effectus est Christianissimus et a Deo protectus filius et spiritalis compater Dominus Pepinus."—*Epist.* xxii. Thou, after God, art our defender and aider; if all the hairs of our head were tongues, we could not give you thanks equal to your deserts.—*Epist.* xxxvi. Throughout it is St. Peter who has anointed Pepin king; St. Peter who is the giver of all Pepin's victories over

the Barbarians; St. Peter whom he protects; St. Peter whose gratitude he has a right to command; and St. Peter is all powerful in heaven.

<sup>p</sup> "Non ob aliud nefandissimi nos persequuntur Græci, nisi propter sanctam et orthodoxam fidem, et venerandorum patrum piam traditionem, quam cupiunt destruere et conculcare."—*Epist.* ad Pepin.

<sup>q</sup> The Greeks still retained Naples and the South of Italy.

have power to exercise—gave a kind of supremacy to the King of the Franks in Rome and her domain. The Pope, tacitly at least, admitted as the representative of the Roman people, awarded this title, which gave him a right to demand protection, while himself, by the donation of Pepin, possessed the actual property and the real power. In the Exarchate he ruled by the direct grant of Pepin, who had conquered this territory from the Lombards, they having previously dispossessed the Greeks. Popes of this time kept up the pious fiction that the donations even of sovereigns, though extending to cities and provinces, were given for holy uses, the keeping up the lights in the churches, and the maintenance of the poor.<sup>r</sup> But who was to demand account of the uses to which these revenues were applied? The Pope took possession as lord and master; he received the homage of the authorities and the keys of the cities. The local or municipal institutions remained; but the revenue, which had before been received by the Byzantine crown, became the revenue of the Church: of that revenue the Pope was the guardian, distributor, possessor.

The pontificate of Paul, on the whole, was a period of peace. If Desiderius, after his first expedition against the rebel Duke of Spoleto, did not maintain strictly amicable relations with the Papal See, he abstained from hostility.

But, as heretofore, the loftier the papal dignity and the greater the wealth and power of the Pope, the more it became an object of unhallowed ambition.

Papacy seized by Toto.

On the death of Paul, that which two centuries later reduced the Papacy to the lowest state of degradation, the violent nomination of the Pope by the petty barons and armed nobles of the neighbouring districts, was prematurely attempted. Toto, the Duke of Nepi, suddenly, before Paul had actually expired, entered the city with his three brothers and a strong armed force.

Jan. 28, 777.

As soon as Paul was dead, they seized a bishop and compelled him to ordain Constantine, one of the brothers, yet a layman. They then took possession of the Lateran

<sup>r</sup> "Unde pro animæ vestræ salute egenorum, vel peregrinorum nihilominus indefessa luminarium concinnatio Dei relevetur, et ad veram saturitatem perveniant."—Steph. ii. ad Pepin. Epist.

palace, and after a hasty form of election, forced the same bishop, George of Palestrina, with two others, Eustratius of Alba and Citonatus of Porto, to consecrate Constantine as Pope.\* The usurper retained possession of the see for more than a year, ordained and discharged all the offices of a pontiff, a period reckoned as a vacancy in the papal annals. At the end of that time two distinguished Romans, Christopher the Primicerius and Sergius his son, made their escape to the court of Pavia, to entreat the intervention of Desiderius. They obtained the aid of some Lombards, chiefly from the duchy of Spoleto, and appeared in arms in the city. Toto at first made a valiant defence, but was betrayed by his own followers and slain. Constantine, the false Pope, with his brother and a bishop named Theodorus, endeavoured to conceal themselves, but were seized by their enemies.

Constantine  
Pope.  
July 6, 777,  
to Aug. 1, 778.

July 29.

During the tumult part of the successful insurgents hastily elected a certain Philip, and installed him in the Lateran palace. The stronger party assembled a more legitimate body of electors, the chief of the clergy, of the army, and of the people. The unanimous choice fell on Stephen III., who had been employed in high offices by Paul.<sup>†</sup> The scenes which followed in the city of the head of Christendom must not be concealed.<sup>‡</sup> The easy victory was terribly avenged on Constantine and his adherents. The Bishop Theodorus was the chief object of animosity. They put out his eyes, cut off his tongue, and shut him up in the dungeon of a monastery, where he was left to die of hunger and of thirst, vainly imploring a drop of water in his agony. They put out the eyes of Passianus, the brother of the usurping Pope, and shut him up in a monastery. They plundered and confiscated all their possessions. The usurper was led through the city riding on a horse with a woman's saddle, with heavy weights to his feet; then brought out, solemnly deposed (for he was yet Pope elect),<sup>§</sup>

July 31.  
Philip.

A.D. 778.  
Stephen III.  
Cruelties in  
Rome.

\* Vit. Stephan. iii.

† He is called Vice Dominus.

‡ Anastas., Vit. Stephan. iii.

§ "Dum adhuc electus extitisset."—  
Vit. Steph. iii.

and thrust into the monastery of Centumcellæ. Even there he was not allowed to repent in peace of his ambition. A party of his enemies first seized a tribune of his faction named Gracilis, put out his eyes, surprised the convent, treated the Pope in the same Aug. 6. inhuman manner, and left him blind and bleeding in the street. These atrocities were not confined to the adherents of Constantine. A presbyter named Waldipert had taken a great part in the revolution, had accompanied Christopher, the leader of the deliverers, to Rome, but he had been guilty of the hasty election of Philip to the papacy. He was accused of a conspiracy to betray the city to the Duke of Spoleto. He fled to the church of the Virgin ad Martyres. Though he clung to and clasped the sacred image, he was dragged out, and plunged into one of the most noisome dungeons in the city. After a few days he was brought forth, his eyes put out, his tongue cut in so barbarous a manner that he died. Some of these might be the acts of a fierce, ungovernable, excited populace; but the clergy, in their collective and deliberative capacity, cannot be acquitted of as savage inhumanity.

The first act of Stephen was to communicate his election to the Patrician, the King of the Franks. Pepin had expired before the arrival of the ambassadors. Aug. 1, 778.

His sons sent a deputation of twelve bishops to Rome. The Pope summoned the bishops of Tuscany, of Campania, and other parts of Italy, and with the Frankish bishops formed a regular Council in the Lateran. The usurper Constantine was brought in, blind and broken in spirit, to answer for his offences. He expressed

the deepest contrition, he grovelled on the earth, he implored the mercy of the priestly tribunal. His sentence was deferred. On his next examination he was asked how, being a layman, he had dared to venture on such an impious innovation as to be consecrated at once a bishop. It is dangerous at times to embarrass adversaries with a strong argument. He replied that it was Punishment of Constantine. no unprecedented innovation; alleged the cases of the Archbishops of Ravenna and of Naples, as promoted

at once from laymen to the episcopate. The indignant clergy rose up, fell upon him, beat him cruelly with their own hands, and turned him out of the church.

All the instruments which related to the usurpation of Constantine were then burned; Stephen solemnly inaugurated; all who had received the communion from the hands of Constantine professed their profound penitence. A decree was passed interdicting, under the strongest anathema, all who should aspire to the episcopate without having passed through the inferior orders. All the ordinations of Constantine were declared null and void;

April 14, 779.

the bishops were thrown back to their inferior orders, and could only attain the episcopate after a new election and consecration. The laymen who had dared to receive these irregular orders fared worse: they were to wear the religious habit for their lives, being incapable of religious functions. This Lateran Council closed its proceedings by an unanimous decree in favour of image-worship, anathematising the godless Iconoclasts of the East.

These tragic scenes closed not with the extinction of the faction of Constantine: new victims suffered the dreadful punishment of blinding, some with seclusion in a monastery, the ordinary sentence of all whose lives were spared in civil conflict. But the causes of this new revolution and the conduct of the Pope are contested and obscure. All that is undoubted is that the King of the Lombards appears as the protector of the Pope; Carloman the Frank, the son of Pepin, threatens his dethronement.<sup>7</sup>

Desiderius, the Lombard King, presented himself before

<sup>7</sup> The great object of dispute, after the surrender of the exarchate, that which the popes constantly demanded, and the Lombard kings endeavoured to elude, was the full restitution of the "justitiæ" claimed by the pope within the Lombard kingdom.—Vit. Stephan. iii. This term, intelligible in the forensic language of the day, is now unmeaning. Muratori defines it, "Allodiale, rendite e diritte, che appartenevano alla chiesa Romana nel regno Longobardico." But what were these allodial rights, in a kingdom of which the full sovereignty was in the Lombards? Were they estates held by the Church, as landlords, like

those in Sicily or elsewhere? or *dues* claimed at least of all *Roman* Christians in Italy? Sismondi's suggestion, that it means the royal cities, the property of the crown, which were administered in France by judges, seems quite inapplicable to the Lombard kingdom (Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, ii. p. 281). Manzoni, in a note to his *Adelchi*, supposes that it was a vague term, intended to comprehend all the demands of the Church. Yet in the epistles of the several popes, the two Stephens, Paul, and Hadrian, it seems to mean something specific and definite. To me Muratori appears nearest to the truth.

Rome with the avowed object of delivering the Pope from the tyranny of Christopher the primicerius, and his son Sergius. These men had been the leaders, with Lombard aid, in the overthrow of the usurper. Christopher and his son hastily gathered some troops, and closed the gates of the city. They were betrayed by Paul (named Afiarta), the Pope's chamberlain, seized, blinded: the elder, Christopher, died of the operation. Desiderius boasted of this service as equivalent to and annulling all the papal claims to certain rights in the cities of Lombardy. Carloman the Frank, on the other hand, espoused the cause of these oppressors, as they were called, of the Pope, who had menaced his life, in conjunction with Dodo, Carloman's ambassador. Carloman threatened to avenge their punishment by marching to Rome and dethroning the Pope. This strange statement is confirmed by a letter of Stephen himself, addressed to Bertha, the mother of the Frankish kings, and to Charlemagne.\* The biographer of Pope Stephen gives an opposite version. The hostility of Desiderius to Christopher and Sergius arose from their zeal in enforcing the papal demands on the Lombard kings. He denounces the Lombards as still the enemies of the Pope, and accuses Paul, the Pope's chamberlain, their ally, of the basest treachery.

At all events this transitory connexion between the pope and the Lombards soon gave way to the old implacable animosity. Whatever might be the claim of Desiderius on the gratitude of Stephen, the intelligence of a proposed intimate alliance between his faithful protectors the Franks, and his irreconcilable enemies the Lombards, struck the Pope with amazement and dismay.

\* "Unde (Christophorus et Sergius, cum Dodone Carlomanni regis misso) in basilicam domni Theodori papæ, ubi sedebamus, introierunt, sicque ipsi maligni homines insidiabantur nos interficere." Cenni, Monument. i. 267. Jaffe,

p. 201. This letter is by some supposed to have been written under compulsion, when Desiderius was master of the Pope and of Rome. Muratori hardly answers this by showing that it was written after the execution of Christopher and Sergius.

## CHAPTER XII.

## CHARLEMAGNE ON THE THRONE.

THE jealousies of Carloman and Charles, the sons of Pepin, who had divided his monarchy, were for a time appeased. Bertha, their mother, seized the opportunity of strengthening and uniting her divided house by intermarriages with the family of the Lombard king. Desiderius was equally desirous of this connexion with the powerful Transalpine kings. His unmarried son, Adelchis, was affianced to Gisela,<sup>a</sup> the sister of Charlemagne; his daughter Hermingard proposed as the wife of one of the royal brothers. Both Carloman and Charles were already married; Carloman was attached to his wife Gisberta, by whom he had children. The ambition of Charles was less scrupulous; he at once divorced his wife, an obscure person, whose name has not been preserved by history, and wedded the daughter of Desiderius. In this union the Pope saw the whole policy of his predecessors threatened with destruction: their mighty protector was become the ally, the brother of their deadly enemy. Already the splendid donation of Pepin seemed wrested from his unresisting hands. Who should now interpose to prevent the Lombards from becoming masters of the Exarchate, of Rome, of Italy? The Pope lost all self-command; he gave vent to the full bitterness of Roman, of papal hatred to the Lombards, and to the agony of his terror, in a remonstrance so unmeasured in its language, so unpapal, it might be said unchristian, in its spirit, as hardly to be equalled in the pontifical diplomacy.<sup>b</sup>

“The devil alone could have suggested such a con-

<sup>a</sup> Or Desiderata. Gisela became a nun.—Eginh., v. k. 1. xviii.

<sup>b</sup> Muratori faintly hints a doubt of its

authenticity; a doubt which he is too honest to assert.

nexion. That the noble, the generous race of the Franks, the most ancient in the world, should ally itself with the foetid brood of the Lombards, a brood hardly reckoned human, and who have introduced the leprosy into the land.<sup>c</sup> What could be worse than this abominable and detestable contagion? Light could not be more opposite to darkness, faith to infidelity.” The Pope does not take his firm stand on the high moral and religious ground of the French princes’ actual marriage. He reminds them of the consummate beauty of the women in their own land; that their father Pepin had been prevented by the remonstrances of the Pope from divorcing their mother; then briefly enjoins them not to dare to dismiss their present wives.<sup>d</sup> Again he urges the evil of contaminating their blood by any foreign admixture (they had already declined an alliance with the Greek emperor), and then insists on the absolute impossibility of their maintaining their fidelity to the papal see, “that fidelity so solemnly sworn by their father, so ratified on his death bed, so confirmed by their own oaths,” if they should thus marry into the perfidious house of Lombardy. The enmity of the Lombards to the papal see is implacable. Wherefore St. Peter himself solemnly adjures them, he, the Pope, the whole clergy, and people of Rome adjure them by all which is awful and commanding, by the living and true God, by the tremendous day of judgment, by all the holy mysteries, and by the most sacred body of St. Peter, that neither of the brothers presume to wed the daughter of Desiderius, or to give the lovely Gisela in wedlock to his son. But if either (what he cannot imagine) should act contrary to this adjuration, by the authority of St. Peter he is under the most terrible anathema, an alien from the kingdom of God, and condemned with the devil and his most wicked

<sup>c</sup> Manzoni has pointed out with great sagacity, that in the 170th law of Rotharis there is a clause prescribing the course to be pursued with lepers; thus showing that the nation was really subject to the disease. Stephen might thus be expressing a common notion, that from the Lombards, at least in Italy, “came the race of the lepers.”

Thus this expression, instead of throwing suspicion, as Muratori supposes, on the letter, confirms its authenticity.—Discorso Storico, subjoined to the tragedy ‘Adelchi,’ p. 199.

<sup>d</sup> “Nec vestras quodammodo conjuges audeatis demittere.” But it is the guilt of the alliance, not of the divorce, on which he dwells.

ministers and with all impious men, to be burned in the eternal fire; but he who shall obey shall be rewarded with everlasting glory."

But Pope Stephen spoke to obdurate ears. Already Charlemagne began to show that, however highly he might prize the alliance of the hierarchy, he was not its humble minister. Lofty as were his notions of religion, he would rarely sacrifice objects of worldly policy. Sovereign as yet of but one-half the dominions of his father Pepin, he had not yet by the death of his brother and the dispossession of his brother's children consolidated the kingdom of the Franks into one great monarchy. It was to his advantage, in case of hostilities (already they had once broken out with his brother), to connect himself with the Lombard kingdom. He married the daughter of Desiderius; and his own irregular passions, not the dread of papal censure, dissolved but a year after the inhibited union.

The acts and the formal documents of the earlier Popes rarely betray traces of individual character. The pontificate of Stephen III. was short—about a year and a half. Yet in him there appears a peculiar passionate feebleness, both in his relation to the heads of the different Roman factions and to the King of the Lombards, no less than in his invective against the marriage of the French princes into the race of Desiderius.

His successors, Hadrian I. and Leo III., not only  
A.D. 768-772,  
Feb. 1. occupy the papal throne at one of the great  
Hadrian I. epochs of its aggrandisement, but their pontificates were of much longer duration than usual. Hadrian entered on the 23rd, Leo on the 21st year of his papacy, and Hadrian at least, a Roman by birth, appears admirably fitted to cope with the exigencies of the times; times pregnant with great events, the total and final disruption of the last links which connected the Byzantine and Western empires, the extinction of the Lombard kingdom, the creation of the Empire of the West.

If the progress of the younger son of Pepin, Charles the Great, to almost universal empire now occupied the attention of the West, it was watched by the Pope with the profoundest interest. If Stephen III. had trembled at the

matrimonial alliance which he had vainly attempted to prevent, between the King of the Franks and the daughter of Desiderius, which threatened to strengthen the closer political relations of those once hostile powers, his fears were soon allayed by the sudden disruption of that short-lived connexion. After one year of wedlock Charles, apparently without alleging any cause, divorced Hermingard, threw back upon her father his repudiated daughter, and embittered the insult by an immediate marriage with Hildegard, a German lady of a noble Suabian house.<sup>d</sup> The careless indifference with which Charlemagne contracted and dissolved that solemn bond of matrimony, the sanctity if not the indissolubility of which the Church had at least begun to assert with the utmost rigour, shocked some of his more pious subjects. Adalhard, the Abbot of Corbey, could not disguise his religious indignation; so little was he versed in courtly ways, he would hold no intercourse with the unlawful wife.<sup>e</sup> Pope Hadrian maintained a prudent silence. He was not called upon officially to take cognisance of the case; and the divorce from the Lombard Princess, the severance of those unhallowed ties with the enemy of the Church against which his predecessor had so strongly protested, might reconcile him to a looser interpretation of the law. A marriage, not merely unblessed but anathematised by the Church, might be considered at least less binding than more hallowed nuptials.

Every step which the ambition of Charles made towards dominion and power, showed, it might be hoped, a more willing and reverent, as well as a more formidable defender of the Church. At his great national assemblies, as in those of his pious father, the bishops met on equal terms with the nobles, the peaceful prelates mingled with the armed counts and dukes in the councils of Charles the Great.

Charlemagne's first Saxon war was a war of religion; it was undertaken to avenge the destruction of a church, the

<sup>d</sup> Eginhard, i. 18.

<sup>e</sup> Paschas. Radbert., Vit. Adalhard Abbatis.—"Nullo negotio beatus senex persuaderi, dum adhuc esset tiro palatii

ut ei, quam vivente illâ, rex acceperat, aliquo communicaret servitutis obsequio."

massacre of a saintly missionary and his Christian congregation.

Even his more questionable acts had the merit of estranging him more irrevocably from the enemies of the Pope. On the death of his brother Carloman, Charles seized the opportunity of reconsolidating the kingdom of his father Pepin. It is difficult to decide how far this usurpation offended against the justice or the usages of the age. The old Teutonic custom gave to the nobles the right of choosing their chieftain from the royal race.<sup>1</sup> A large party of the Austrasian feudatories, how induced or influenced we may conjecture rather than assert, deliberately preferred a mature and able sovereign to the precarious rule of helpless and inexperienced children. Some, however, of the nobles, more strongly attached to the right of hereditary succession, more jealous of the rising power of Charles, or out of generous compassion, adhered to the claims of Carloman's children, who, thus dispossessed, took refuge at the court of the Lombard Desiderius. The opportunity of revenge was too tempting for the rival king and the insulted father; he espoused their cause; but the alliance with Desiderius put the fatherless children at once out of the pale of the Papal sympathy. Desiderius thought he saw his advantage; he appealed to the justice, to the compassion, to the gratitude of the head of Christendom; he urged him to befriend the orphans, to anoint the heirs of the pious Carloman, and thus to recognise their royal title, as their papal predecessors had anointed Pepin, Carloman, and Charles.

A.D. 772.

But Hadrian had too much sagacity not to discern the rising power of Charles, and would not be betrayed by any rashly-generous emotions into measures hostile to his interests. Desiderius resented his steadfast refusal. He heard at the same time of the death of his faithful partisan in Rome, Paul Afiarta, whom the Pope had condemned to exile in Constantinople. Paul, accused of having blinded

<sup>1</sup> Eginhard may show that this was a right, claimed at least by the common sentiment of the day. Of the Mero-

vingians he says, in the first sentence of his life of Charlemagne, "*Gens . . . de qua Franci reges sibi creare soliti erant.*"

and killed the secondary Sergius, before the decease of Pope Stephen, had been put to death, not, it was declared, with the connivance of the Pope, before he could leave Italy.<sup>s</sup>

Desiderius supposed that Charles was fully occupied in establishing his sovereignty over his brother's kingdom, and in the war against the Saxons. He <sup>King Desiderius.</sup> collected his forces, fell on Sinigaglia, Montefeltro, Urbino, and Gubbio, and ravaged the whole country of Romagna with fire and sword. His troops besieged, stormed, and committed a frightful massacre in Blera, a town of Tuscany, and already threatened the Pope in his capital. Desiderius, at the head of his army, and accom- <sup>A.D. 773.</sup>panied by all his family, advanced towards Rome to compel an interview declined resolutely by the Pontiff.

Hadrian relied not on the awe of his personal presence, by which Popes on former occasions had subdued the hostility of Lombard kings. He sent mes- <sup>Hadrian sends to Charlemagne.</sup>sengers in the utmost haste to solicit, to entreat immediate succour from Charles, but he himself neglected no means for the defence of Rome. Hadrian (a new office for a Pope) superintended the military preparations; he gathered troops from Tuscany, Campania, and every district within his power; strengthened the fortifications of Rome, transported the sacred treasures from the less defensible churches of St. Peter and St. Paul into the heart of the city; barricaded the gates of the Vatican, and having so done, reverted to his spiritual arms. He sent three Bishops, of Alba, Palestrina, Tibur, to meet the King, and to threaten him with excommunication if he dared to violate the territory of the Church. Desiderius had reached Viterbo; he was struck with awe, or with the intelligence of the preparations of Charles.

The ambassadors of the Frank arrived in Rome; on their return they passed through Pavia. Desiderius had returned to his capital: they urged him to reconciliation

<sup>s</sup> The death of Paul Afiarta was attributed to the indiscreet zeal of Leo, Archbishop of Ravenna (Leo owed his archiepiscopate to Pope Stephen). It was disclaimed by Hadrian: "Animam ejus cupiens salvare, pœnitentiæ eum

submitti decreveram . . . huc Romam eum deferendum."—Vit. Hadrian. Paul Afiarta's crime was that he had pledged himself to bring the Pope, willing or unwilling, before Desiderius.—Ibid.

with the Pope. New ambassadors arrived, offering a large sum, ostensibly for his concessions to the demands of the Pope, but no doubt for the surrender of Carloman's children, whom Charles was anxious to get into his power.

Desiderius, who would not know the disproportion of his army to that of Charles, blindly resisted all accommodation. With his usual rapidity Charles, who had already assembled his forces, approached the passes of the Alps, one division that of Mont Cenis, the other that of the Mont St. Bernard. Treachery betrayed the passes,<sup>b</sup> in one of which, however, the hosts of Charlemagne suffered a signal defeat by the Lombards, under Adelchis, the king's son. This was no doubt the secret of the Lombard weakness. The whole of the Roman population of Lombardy looked to the Pope as their head and representative; to the Franks as their deliverers. The two races had not mingled; the Lombards were but an armed aristocracy, lording it over a hostile race. A sudden famine dispersed the victorious troops of Adelchis, who still guarded the descent from Mont Cenis. Adelchis shut himself up in Verona; and Charles, encountering no enemy on the open plain, laid siege to Pavia. That city was, for those times, strongly fortified; it resisted for many months. During the siege, in the

A.D. 774,  
April 2.

Holy Week of the next year, the King of the Franks proceeded to Rome to perform his devotions at the shrine of St. Peter, and to knit more closely his league with the Pope. Charles was already the deliverer, it might be hoped he would be the faithful protector of the Church. Excepting the cities of Verona and Pavia, he was already master of all Northern Italy. With his father Pepin, he had been honoured with the name of Patrician of Rome; by this vague adoption, which the lingering pride of Rome might still esteem an honour to a Barbarian, he was head of the Roman republic. He might become, in their hopes, the guardian, the champion of the old Roman

<sup>b</sup> "A suis quippe fideles callidè ei traditus fuit."—Chron. Salernit. This chronicle shows the curious transition from the Latin inflexion to the unflected Italian, "et dum de fatus Karolus Sermo."  
<sup>1</sup> A.D. 773, October. Muratori sub. ann.

society, while at the same time his remote residence beyond the Alps diminished the danger which was always apprehended from neighbouring barbarians.

*In Rome.*

Accordingly the civil and ecclesiastical authorities vied in the honours which they paid to the Patrician of Rome and the dutiful son of the Church, who had so speedily obeyed the summons of his spiritual father, and had come to prostrate himself before the relics of the Apostles. At Novi, thirty miles distant, he was met by the Senate and the nobles of the city, with their banners spread. For a mile before the gates the way was lined by the military and the *schools*. At the gates all the crosses and the standards of the city, as was usual on the entrance of the Exarchs, the representatives of the Emperor, went out to meet the Patrician. As soon as he beheld the cross, Charles dismounted from his horse, proceeded on foot with all his officers and nobles to the Vatican, where the Pope and the clergy, on the steps of St. Peter's, stood ready to receive him; as he slowly ascended he reverently kissed the steps; at the top he was affectionately embraced by the Pope. Charles attended with profound devotion during all the ceremonies of the Holy Season; at the close he ratified the donation of his father Pepin. The diploma which contained the solemn gift was placed upon the altar of St. Peter. Yet there is much obscurity as to the extent and the tenure of this most magnificent oblation ever made to the Church. The original record has long perished; its terms are but vaguely known. It is said to have comprehended the whole of Italy, the exarchate of Ravenna, from Istria to the frontiers of Naples, including the island of Corsica. The nature of the Papal tenure and authority is still more difficult to define. Was it the absolute alienation of the whole temporal power to the Pope? In what consisted the sovereignty still claimed and exercised by Charlemagne over the whole of Italy, even over Rome itself?

Charlemagne made this donation as lord by conquest over the Lombard kingdom, and the territory of the Exarchate; for Pavia at length fell. Desiderius took refuge in the usual asylum of dethroned kings,

*Donation of  
Charlemagne.*

a monastery. His son, Adelchis, abandoned Verona, and fled to Constantinople. Thus expired the kingdom of the Lombards; and Charles added to his royal titles that of Lombardy. The Exarchate, by his grant, was vested, either as a kind of feud, or in absolute perpetuity, in the Pope.<sup>1</sup>

But, notwithstanding the grant of the conqueror, the Pope did not enter into undisputed possession of this territory. An ecclesiastic, Leo, the Archbishop of Ravenna, set up a rival claim. He withheld the cities of

Faenza, Forlì, Forlimpopoli, Cesena, Bobbio, A.D. 775. Comachio, Ferrara, Imola, the whole Pentapolis, Bologna, from their allegiance to the see of Rome, ejected the judges appointed by Rome, and appointed others of his own authority in the whole region, and sent missives throughout the province to prevent their submission to the papal officers.<sup>k</sup>

Hadrian became the scorn of his enemies, who inquired what advantage he had gained by the destruction of the Lombards. He wrote the most pressing letter to Charles, entreating him to prevent this humiliation of St. Peter and his successors. The Archbishop of Ravenna succeeded to the title which, in the language of the papal correspondence, belongs to all the adversaries of the Pope's temporal greatness, the "Most wicked of Men."<sup>1</sup> The Pope asserted his right to the judicial authority, not only over the cities of the Pentapolis, but in Ravenna itself.

But the rivalry of Ravenna did not long restrain the ambition of a pontiff, secure in the protection of Charlemagne.

<sup>1</sup> See the passage quoted by Muratori from the anonymous Scriptor Salernitanus, sub anno 774. The Lombard dukedom of Benevento raised itself into a principality, and asserted its independence.

<sup>k</sup> Agnelli, Vit. Pontif. Ravennat.—"Troppo è credibile, che questo sagace ed ambizioso prelato s'ingegnasse di far intendere a Carlo, ch'è avrebbe egualmente potuto servire a onor di Dio, e de' santi apostoli, la liberalità, ch'è fosse piaciuto al re di fare alla chiesa di Ravenna, come a quella di Roma; ch'è già non mancavano ai Romani pontifici uber-

tosì patrimoni in più parte d'Italia à di Sicilia," &c. &c. This ingenious conjecture of Denina (*Revoluz. d'Italia*, vol. i. p. 352) is but conjecture.

<sup>1</sup> Nefandissimus. Compare Muratori, *Annal. d'Italia*, sub ann. 777. The epistle does not state on what the Archbishop of Ravenna rested his claim to this jurisdiction. This dispute shows still further the ambiguous and undefined supremacy supposed to be conferred, even in his own day, by the donation of Charlemagne. Did the Archbishop claim in any manner to be Patrician of the Exarchate? See following note.

After some time, and some menaced interference from the East, Hadrian took possession of the Exarchate, <sup>Hadrian in possession of the Exarchate.</sup> seemingly with the power and privileges of a temporal prince. Throughout the Exarchate of Ravenna, he had "his men," who were judged by magistrates of his appointment, owed him fealty, and could not leave the land without his special permission. Nor are these only ecclesiastics subordinate to his spiritual power (that spiritual supremacy Hadrian indeed asserted to the utmost extent; Rome had a right of judicature over all churches).<sup>m</sup> His language to Charlemagne is that of a feudal suzerain also: "as your men are not allowed to come to Rome without your permission and special letter, so my men must not be allowed to appear at the court of France without the same credentials from me." The same allegiance which the subjects of Charlemagne owed to him, was to be required from the subjects of the See of Rome to the Pope. "Let him be thus admonished, we are to remain in the service, and under the dominion of the blessed apostle St. Peter, to the end of the world." The administration of justice was in the Pope's name; not only the ecclesiastical dues, and the rents of estates forming part of the patrimony of St. Peter, the civil revenue likewise came into his treasury. Hadrian bestows on Charlemagne, as a gift, the marbles and mosaics of the imperial palace in Ravenna, that palace apparently his own undisputed property."

Such was the allegiance claimed over the Exarchate and the whole territory included in the donation of Pepin and of Charlemagne, with all which the ever watchful Pope was continually adding, parts of the old Sabine territory, of Campania and of Capua, to the immediate jurisdiction of the Papacy. Throughout these territories the old Roman institutions remained under the Pope as Patrician, the

<sup>m</sup> "Quanta enim auctoritas B. Petro Apostolorum principi, ejusque sacratissimæ sedi concessa est, cuiquam non ambigimus ignorari: utpote quæ de omnibus ecclesiis fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam liceat de ejus judicare judicio. Quorumlibet sententias legati Pontificum, Sedes B. Petri Apostoli jus habet solvendi, per quos ad unam Petri

sedem universalis ecclesiæ cura confluit, et nihil unquam a suo capite dissidet."—Epist. Hadrian ad Carol. Magn. Cod. Carol. lxxxv., apud Bouquet, p. 579.

<sup>n</sup> "Tam marmora, quamque mosaicum, cæteraque exempla de eodem palatio vobis concedimus auferenda."—Epist. lxxvii. apud Gretser.

Patriciate seemed tantamount to imperial authority.<sup>o</sup> The city of Rome alone maintained with the form somewhat of the independence of a republic. Hadrian, with the power, assumed the magnificence of a great potentate: his expenditure in Rome, more especially, as became his character, on the religious buildings, was profuse; Rome, with the increase of the papal revenues, began to resume more of her ancient splendour.

Twice during the pontificate of Hadrian, Charlemagne again visited Rome. The first time was an act of religious homage, connected with his future political plans. He came to celebrate the baptism of his younger son Pepin by the Pope, a son for whom he destined the kingdom of Italy. The second time he came as a protector, at the summons of the Pope, to deliver him from a new and formidable enemy at the gates of Rome. Arigiso the Lombard Duke of Benevento, who had married the daughter of Desiderius, had grown in power, and around him had rallied all the adversaries of the Papal and the Frankish interests. It was a Lombard league, embracing almost all Italy — Rotgadis Duke of Friuli, his father-in-law Stebelin, Count of Treviso, the Duke of Spoleto. Arigiso had obtained the title of Patrician, with all its vague and indefinite pretensions, from Constantinople; he was in close correspondence with Adelchis, the son of the fallen Desiderius. Hadrian accused this dangerous neighbour of hostile encroachments on the patrimony of St. Peter. He entreated the invincible Charlemagne to cross the Alps to his succour. Charlemagne obeyed. He passed the Christmas at Pavia. He appeared at Rome: the Lombard shrunk from

<sup>o</sup> The Frankish monarch, afterwards the Emperor, was the *Patrician* of Rome. On the vague yet extensive authority conveyed by this title of Patrician, Muratori is the most full and satisfactory. Charlemagne, as his ancestors had been, was Patrician of Rome. Was this only an honorary title, while the civil supremacy over the city was vested in a republic (so Pagi supposes, but according to others this notion is purely imaginary), or did the office in-

vest him in full imperial authority? That he had a theoretic supremacy, the surrender to the successive Frankish monarchs of the keys of the city and of the sepulchre of St. Peter clearly shows. As imperial representative, or substitute, there was a Patrician of Sicily. The Lombard Dukes of Benevento obtained a grant of the *Patriciate* from Constantinople. The Pope claimed to be *Patrician* of the Exarchate. (See above.)

the unequal contest, and purchased peace by an annual tribute of 7000 pieces of gold. He gave his two sons as hostages for the fulfilment of the treaty.<sup>p</sup> Hadrian, however, did not feel secure; he still suspected the designs and intrigues of the Lombard. The death of Arigiso, in the same year in which he swore allegiance to Charlemagne, did not allay the jealousies of Hadrian; for Charlemagne, in his generosity, placed the son of Arigiso, Grimoald, in the Dukedom of Benevento. Grimoald, during the life-time of Charlemagne, repaid this generosity by a faithful adoption, not only of the interests, but even the usages of the Franks. He shaved his beard, and clothed himself after the Frank fashion. In later days he became a formidable rival of Pepin, the son of Charlemagne, for the ascendancy in Italy.

<sup>p</sup> Rebellion suppressed.  
A.D. 787.

A.D. 788.

While Charlemagne was yet at Rome, a more formidable rebellion began to lower. Adelchis, the son of Desiderius, was upon the seas with a considerable Greek force, supplied by order of the Byzantine Emperor, Constantine. The Huns broke into Bavaria and Friuli. Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria, whose wife Liutberga was the sister of Adelchis, meditated revolt. Charlemagne, with his wonted rapidity, appeared in Germany. Tassilo was summoned before a diet at Ingelheim. He dared not refuse to appear; was condemned to capital punishment; in mercy shut up, with his son, in a monastery. His Lombard wife suffered the same fate. The Huns were driven back; the Greek army deserted Adelchis; the son of Desiderius fled; John, the Byzantine general, was strangled in prison.

This great pontiff Hadrian, who, during above twenty-four years, had reposed, not undisturbed, but safe under the mighty protection of Charlemagne, died before the close of the eighth century. The coronation of Charlemagne, as Emperor of the West, was reserved for his successor. At that coronation our history will pause to take

A.D. 796.  
Death of  
Hadrian.

<sup>p</sup> Eginhard, Vit. Karol., x.; Annal. sub ann. 786. Compare the very strange account in the Chronic. Salernit. 9, 10, 11, of the interference of the bishops at Benevento to save Arigiso from the wrath of

Charlemagne; and the conspiracy of Paulus Diaconus, the historian, to murder Charlemagne. "How," says the Emperor, when urged to punish him, "can I cut off one who writes so elegantly?"

a survey of Latin Christendom, now a separate Western Empire, under one temporal, and under one spiritual sovereign. Charlemagne showed profound sorrow for the death of Hadrian. He wept for him, according to his biographer,<sup>9</sup> as if he had been a brother or a dear son. An epitaph declared to the world the respect and attachment of the Sovereign of the West for his spiritual father.

On the death of Hadrian,<sup>7</sup> an election of unexampled rapidity, and, as it seemed, of perfect unanimity among the clergy, the nobles, and the people, raised Leo III. to the pontifical throne.<sup>8</sup> The first act of Leo was to recognise the supremacy of Charles, by sending the keys, not only of the city, with the standard of Rome, but those also of the sepulchre of St. Peter, to the Patrician. This unusual act of deference seems as if Leo anticipated the necessity of foreign protection; even the precipitancy of the election may lead to the suspicion that the unanimity was but outward. Secret causes of dissatisfaction were brooding in the minds of some of the leading men in Rome. The strong hand of Hadrian had kept down the factions which had disturbed the reign of his predecessor Stephen; now it is among the court, the family of Hadrian, even those whom he had raised to the highest offices, that there is first sullen submission, ere long furious strife. Dark rumours spread abroad of serious charges against the Pope himself. Leo III. ruled, however, in seeming peace for three years and two months, at the close of which a frightful scene betrayed the deep and rooted animosity.

Hadrian had invested his two nephews, Paschalis and Campulus, in two great ecclesiastical offices, the Præmicerius and Sacellarius. This first example of nepotism was a dismal omen of the fatal partiality of future Popes for their kindred. These two men, or one of them, may have aspired to the Pontificate, or they hoped to place a pontiff, more under their own influence, on the throne: their dark crime implies dark motives. The Pope was to

<sup>9</sup> Eginhard, c. xix.

<sup>8</sup> Ann. Til. sub ann. 796; Eginhard,

<sup>7</sup> Hadrian died on Christmas day. Annal.

The election was on the following day, that of St. Stephen, A.D. 795.

ride in solemn pomp, on St. George's day, to the church of St. Lawrence, called in Lucinâ. These ecclesiastics formed part of the procession. One of them excused himself for some informality in his dress.<sup>1</sup> On a sudden, a band of armed men sprang from their ambush. The Pope was thrown from his horse, and an awkward attempt was made to practise the Oriental punishment of mutilation, as yet rare in the West, to put out his eyes, and to cut out his tongue. Paschalis and Campulus, instead of defending the Pope, dragged him into a neighbouring church, and there, before the high altar, attempted to complete the imperfect mutilation, beat him cruelly, and left him weltering in his blood. From thence they took him away by night (no one seems to have interposed in his behalf), carried him to the convent of St. Erasmus, and there threw him into prison. Leo recovered his sight and his speech; and this restoration, of course, in process of time became a miracle.<sup>2</sup> His enemies had failed in their object, the disqualifying him by mutilation for the Papacy. A faithful servant rescued him, and carried him to the church of St. Peter. There, no doubt he found temporary protectors, until the Duke of Spoleto (Winegis), a Frank, marched into Rome to his deliverance, and removed him from the guilty city to Spoleto.

Urgent letters entreated the immediate presence of the Patrician, of Charles the protector of the Papacy, in Rome. But Charles was at a distance, about to engage in quelling an insurrection of the Saxons.<sup>3</sup> The Pope condescended, or rather was compelled by his necessities, to accept the summons to appear in person before the Transalpine monarch. Charles was holding his court and camp at Paderborn, one of the newly-erected German bishoprics. The reception of Leo was courteous and friendly, magni-

<sup>1</sup> He was sine planetâ.

<sup>2</sup> "Carnifices geminas traxerunt fronte fenestras,

Et celerem abscidunt lacerato corpore linguam.

Sed manus alma Patris oculis medicamina ademptis

Obtulit atque novo reparavit lumine vultum;

Explicat et celerem truncataque lingua loquelam."

—See the poem of Angilbert, the poet of Charlemagne's court, Pertz., ii. p. 400. The papal biographer is modest as to the miracle.

<sup>3</sup> Eginhard, Ann. 799.

ficient as far as circumstances might permit. The poet describes the imperial banquet; nor does he fear to shock his more austere readers by describing the Pope and the Emperor as quaffing their rich wines with convivial glee.<sup>7</sup>

But at the same time arrived accusations of some unknown and mysterious nature against the Pope; accusations, according to the annalists, made in the name of the Roman people.<sup>8</sup> Charles did not decline, but postponed till his arrival in Rome the judicial investigation of these charges; but he continued to treat the Pope with undiminished respect and familiarity.

The return of Leo to Rome is said to have been one long triumph. Throughout Italy he was received with the honours of the apostle. The clergy and people of Rome thronged forth to meet him, as well as the military, among whom were bands (scholars) of Franks, of Frisians, and of Saxons, either at Rome for purposes of devotion, or as a foreign body-guard of the Pope.

The journey of Charles to Rome was slow. He went to Rouen, to Tours, to pay his adorations at the shrine of St. Martin. There his wife, Liutgarda, died, and her funeral caused further delay. He then held a great diet at Mentz; and towards the close of the following year crossed the Alps, and halted at Ravenna. At Nomentana he was met by the Pope with high honours. After he had entered Rome he was received on the steps of St. Peter's by the Pope, the bishops, and the clergy; he passed into the church, the whole assembly joining in the solemn chaunt of thanksgiving.

But Charles did not appear at Rome as the avowed protector and avenger of the injured Pope against those who had so barbarously violated his sacred person. He assumed the office of judge.<sup>9</sup> At a synod held some days after, a long and difficult investigation of the charges made against Leo by his enemies proceeded,

<sup>7</sup> Angilbert, apud Pertz. ii. 401, describes, as an eye-witness, the meeting of the Pope and the Emperor.

<sup>8</sup> "Quæ a populo Romano ei objiciebantur."

<sup>9</sup> The clergy, according to the biographer, refused to judge the Pope, declaring their incompetency.

without protest from the Pope.<sup>b</sup> Paschalis and Campulus were summoned to prove their charges. On their failure, they were condemned to death; a sentence commuted, by the merciful interposition of the Pope, to imprisonment in France. Their other noble partisans were condemned to decapitation. Yet this exculpation of Leo hardly satisfied the public mind. It was thought necessary that the Pope should openly, in the face of the people, in the sight of God, and holding the holy Gospels in his hands, avouch his own innocence. There was no complaint Dec. 23. of the majesty of heaven insulted in his person, no reproof for the indignity offered to St. Peter in his successor; it was a kind of recognition of the tribunal of public opinion. The humiliation had something of the majesty of conscious blamelessness,—“I, Leo, Pontiff of the Holy Roman Church, being subject to no judgment, under no compulsion, of my own free will, in your presence, before God who reads the conscience, and his angels, and the blessed Apostle Peter, in whose sight we stand, declare myself not guilty of the charges made against me. I have never perpetrated, nor commanded to be perpetrated,<sup>c</sup> the wicked deeds of which I have been accused. This I call God to witness, whose judgment we must all undergo; and this I do, bound by no law, nor wishing to impose this custom on my successors, or on my brother bishops, but that I may altogether relieve you from any unjust suspicions against myself.”<sup>d</sup>

This solemn judgment had hardly passed when Christmas day arrived: the Christmas of the last year in the eighth century of Christ. Charles and all his sumptuous court, the nobles and people of Rome, the whole clergy of Rome, were present at the high services of the Nativity. The Pope himself chaunted the mass, the full assembly

<sup>b</sup> “In quibus vel maximum vel difficillimum erat.”—Eginhard, Ann. Eginhard expressly says, “Hujus factionis fuere principes Paschalis nomenclator et Campulus Sacellarius et multi alii Romanæ urbis habitatores nobiles.”—Ibid.

<sup>c</sup> These words positively negative the notion that the crime of which Leo was

accused was adultery or unchastity, which some expressions in Alcuin’s letters seem to intimate. I cannot help suspecting that the charge was some simoniacal proceeding (spiritual adultery), by which he had thwarted the ambitious views of Hadrian’s relatives.

<sup>d</sup> Baronius gives this form as “ex sacris ritibus Romanæ Ecclesiæ.”

were wrapt in profound devotion. At the close the Pope arose, advanced towards Charles, with a splendid crown in his hands, placed it upon his brow, and proclaimed him Cæsar Augustus. "God grant life and victory to the great and pacific Emperor." His words were lost in the acclamations of the soldiery, the people, and the clergy. Charles, with his son Pepin, humbly submitted to the ratification of this important act, and was anointed by the hands of the Pope.

Was this a sudden and unconcerted act of gratitude, a magnificent adulation of the Pope to the unconscious and hardly consenting Emperor? Had Leo deliberately contemplated the possible results of this assumption of authority—of this creation of a successor to the Cæsars over Latin Christendom? In what character did the Pope perform this act—as vicegerent of God on earth, as the successor of St. Peter, or as the representative of the Roman people? What rights did it convey? In what, according to the estimation of the times, consisted the Imperial supremacy? To these questions history returns but vague and doubtful answers. Charlemagne—writes Eginhard the secretary of the Emperor, the one contemporary authority—declared that holy as was the day (the Lord's nativity), if he had known the intention of the Pope he would not have entered the church.\* To treat this speech as mere hypocrisy agrees neither with the character nor the position of Charles; yet the Pope would hardly, even in the lavish excess of his gratitude, have ventured on such a step, if he had not reason, from his long conferences with the Emperor at Paderborn, and his intercourse in Rome, to suppose that it was in accordance at least with the unavowed and latent ambition of Charles. In its own day it was perhaps a more daring and violent measure than it appears in ours. A Barbarian monarch, a Teuton, was declared the successor of the Cæsars. He became the usurper of the rights of the Byzantine emperors, which, though fallen into desuetude, had never been abandoned on their part, or

\* Eginhard, in Vit. xx.; but Eginhard adds, "Insidiam tamen suscepti nominis Romanis Imperatoribus super hoc indignantibus, magnâ tulit patientiâ, vicitque eorum contumaciam magnanimitate."—Vit. Kar., xxviii.

abrogated by any competent authority.<sup>f</sup> The Eastern Cæsars had not been without jealousy of the progress of the Frankish dominion. The later Greek emperors sent repeated but vain remonstrances. It was alleged that the Greek Empire having fallen to a woman, Irene, and that woman detestable as the murderess of her son, in her the Byzantine Empire had come to an end. But the enmity of the Byzantine court to Charlemagne had betrayed itself by acts of hostility. Adelchis, the heir of the Lombard kingdom, that kingdom of which Charlemagne had assumed the title, still held the dignity of Roman Patrician in Constantinople.<sup>g</sup>

The significance of this act, the coronation, the subsequent anointing, the recognition by the Roman people, was not merely an accession of vague and indefinite grandeur (which it undoubtedly was), but added to the substantive power of Charlemagne. It was the consolidation of all Western Christendom under one monarchy. By establishing this sovereignty on the basis of the old Roman empire, it could not but gain something of the stability of ancient right.<sup>h</sup> It was the voluntary submission of the Barbarians to the title at least of Roman dominion. In Rome Charlemagne affected to be a Roman: he condescended to put off his native Frankish dress, and appeared in the

<sup>f</sup> "Imperatores etiam Constantino-politani, Nicephorus, Michael et Leo, ultro amicitiam et societatem ejus expetentes, complures ad eum misere legatos; cum quibus tamen propter suspectum a se Imperatoris nomen et ob hoc quasi qui Imperium eis præripere vellet, valde suspectum, fœdus firmissimum statuit, ut nulla inter partes cujuslibet scandali remaneret occasio. Erat enim semper Romanis et Græcis suspecta Francorum potentia, quia ipsam Romam matrem Imperii tenebat, ubi semper Cæsares et Imperatores soliti erant sedere."—Chron. Moissiac. In the other copy of this Chronicle (apud Bouquet, p. 79), we read, "Delati quidem sunt ad eum dicentes, quod apud Græcos nomen Imperii cessasset, et femina apud eos nomen Imperii teneret, Hirena nomine, quæ filium suum Imperatorem fraude captum oculos eruit, et nomen sibi imperii usurpavit." Compare, for a

curious passage, *Annal. Lauresheimenses*, sub eodem anno. The chronicle of Salerno says: "Imperator quippe omnimodis non dici possit, nisi qui regnum Romanum præest, hoc est Constantino-politanum. Reges Galliarum nunc usurparunt sibi talem nomen, nam antiquitus omnimodis sic non vocitati sunt."—c. ii.

<sup>g</sup> "In Constantinopoli itaque in patri-ciatu ordine atque honore consenuit."—Eginhard, 774.

<sup>h</sup> Eginhard, c. 23. But compare Le-huerou, p. 362, who attributes Charle-magne's reluctance to assume the empire, and his apparent depreciation of the importance of the title of Cæsar, to the dominant Teutonicism of his character. Lehuierou espouses the theory that the emperor was only the advocate of the Church of Rome. But this was a purely German theory utterly unknown to Pope Hadrian or Pope Leo, and to the Roman Italians.

long tunic and chlamys, and with Roman sandals. While the Barbarians were flattered by this their complete incorporation with the old disdainful Roman society, the Latins, conscious that in the Franks resided the real power, still aimed at maintaining their traditionary superiority in intellectual matters—a superiority which Charlemagne might hope to emulate, not to surpass. The Pope (for Charlemagne swore at the same time to maintain all the power and privileges of the Roman Pontiff) obtained the recognition of a spiritual dominion commensurate with the secular empire of Charlemagne. The Emperor and the Pope were bound in indissoluble alliance; and notwithstanding the occasional outbursts of independence, or even superiority, asserted by Charlemagne himself, he still professed and usually showed the most profound veneration for the Roman spiritual supremacy; and left to his successors and to their subjects an awful sense of subjugation, from which they were not emancipated for ages.

The imperial title was understood no doubt, by the senate and people of Rome, to be conferred by themselves, as representing the republic, not by the Pope, of his sole religious authority. Without their assenting acclamations, it would not have been valid in their estimation. The Pope, as one of the people, as his subject therefore, paid adoration to the Emperor.<sup>1</sup>

But it is even more difficult to ascertain the rights which the imperial title conveyed in Rome itself, especially in one important particular. Rome became, it is clear, one of the subject cities of Charlemagne's empire. Even if the Pope had ever possessed any actual or asserted magisterial power, the events of the last year had shown that he did not govern Rome. He had no force, even for his personal security against conspiracy or popular tumult. But the Emperor of Rome was bound to protect the Bishop of Rome: he was the conservator of the peace in this as in all the other cities of his empire. Though here, as elsewhere, there was no abolition of the old Roman municipal

<sup>1</sup> "Et summus eundem  
Præsul adoravit, sicut mos debitus olim  
Principibus fuit antiquis, ac nomine dempto

Patricii, quo dictus erat prius, inde vocari  
[Augustus meruit plus, Imperit quoque prin-  
ceps." *Pœta Sæzo, sub ann. 801.*

institutions, the Senate still subsisted, the people called itself the Roman people; the shadow of a republic which had been suffered to survive throughout the Empire, and had occasionally seemed to acquire form, if not substance, still lurked beneath the Teutonic, as in later times beneath the Papal, sovereignty. The great undefined, undefinable point was the conflicting right of the Emperor, the clergy, and the people, in the election and ratification of the election to the Popedom; as well as that which was hereafter to be the source of such long and internecine strife, the boundary of the two sovereignties, the temporal and the spiritual, the fatal feud which for centuries distracted Latin Christendom.

It was perhaps in its vagueness that chiefly dwelt its majesty and power, both as regards the Pope who bestowed and the Frank who received the Empire. In some unknown, undefined manner, the Empire of the West flowed from the Pope; the successor of St. Peter named, or sanctioned the naming of the successor of Augustus and of Nero. The enormous power of Charlemagne, as contrasted with that of the Pope, disguised or ennobled the bold fiction, quelled at least all present inquiry, silenced any insolent doubt. If Charlemagne acknowledged the right of the Pope to bestow the Empire by accepting it at his hands, who should presume either to question the right of the Pope to define the limits of the Imperial authority thus bestowed and thus received? And Charlemagne's elevation to the Empire invested his protection of the Pope in the more sacred character of a duty belonging to his office, ratified all his grants, which were now those not only of a conqueror<sup>\*</sup> but of a successor to all the rights of the Cæsars. On one side the Teuton became a Roman, the King of the Franks was merged in the Western Emperor; on the other, Rome created the sovereign of the West, the sovereign of Latin Christendom.

\* All writers, even ecclesiastics, call Charlemagne's descent into Italy a conquest. — See epitaph on his Queen Hildegard at Metz.

"Cumque vir arripotens sceptris junxisset  
avilis  
Cycniferumque Padum, Romuleumque Ti-  
brim."  
*Pauli Gesta Episc. Met. Pertz, i. 266.*

# CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.—BOOK V.

POPES.		PATRIARCHS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.		EMPERORS OF THE WEST.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
795 Leo III.	816	794 Tarasius	800	800 Charlemagne	814	797 Irene, deposed	808
		806 Nicephorus, deposed	815			808 Nicephorus	811
816 Stephen III.	817	815 Theodorus		814 Louis the Pious	840	811 Stauracius, deposed	811
817 Præchal I.	894	821 Cassidorus	821	817 Lothair I.	855	811 Michael Rhangabes	813
824 Eugenius II.	827	821 Antonius	825			813 Leo the Armenian, murdered	820
827 Valentinus		828 John VII., expelled	828	<i>Kings of Germany.</i>		820 Michael the Stammerer	828
827 Gregory IV.	844	828 Theodorus	846	826 Louis the German	875	828 Theophilus	842
844 Sergius II.	847	846 Ignatius, deposed	857			842 Michael the Drunkard	847
847 Leo IV.	855			830 Louis II.	875		
855 Benedict III.	858						
856 (Anastasius antipope)		857 Photius, deposed	867			857 Basil the Macedonian	866
856 Nicolas I.	867	867 Ignatius, restored	877	873 Charles the Bald			
867 Hadrian II.	873	877 Photius, restored	888				
873 John VIII.	898	Again deposed	888	876 Louis II.		876 Louis the Stammerer	879
888 Marinus I.	894			884 Charles the Fat	887	879 Louis III. and Carloman	884
894 Hadrian III.	895	886 Stephen	888	888 Arnulf, emperor in Germany		888 Eudes	
895 Stephen V.	891	888 Antoninus II.	895				
891 Formosus	896	895 Nicolas, deposed	906	886 Arnulf, emperor in Germany		886 Leo the Philosopher	911
896 Boniface II.							
896 Stephen VI.	897			<i>German Emperors.</i>			
897 Romanus				900 Louis III.	913		
897 Theodorus II.		906 Euthymius I., deposed	911				
898 John IX.	900	911 Nicolas, restored	925			911 Alexander.	
900 Benedict IV.	908					912 Constantine Porphyrogenitus	919
908 Leo V.	908	925 Stephen II.	939	912 Conrad	920	919 Romanus.	
908 Christopher	904	928 Tryphon, deposed	931	928 Henry the Fowler	920		
904 Sergius IV.	911	931 Vacant	938				
911 Anastasius III.	913	936 Theophylact	956	936 Otto I., the Great	973		
913 Lando	914					936 Louis d'Outre-Mer	954
914 John X.	928						
		956 Polyuctus	970	947 Lothair	950	954 Constantine IX.	958
928 Leo VI.	930			950 Berengar II.	964		
928 Stephen VII.	931						
931 John XI.	936			964 Otto		950 Romanus II.	968
936 Leo VII.	939	970 Basil I., deposed	974			958 Nicephorus	968
939 Stephen VIII.	943					968 John Zimisces	975
943 Marinus II.	946	974 Antonius III., Studites	988	973 Otto II.	988		
946 Agapetus II.	955	988 Nicolas II.	996	988 Otto III.	1002	975 Basil II. and Constantine X.	1025
955 John XII.	958						
958 Leo VIII.	963						
963 Benedict V., antipope (?)						988 Louis le Faisant	997
963 John XIII.	973	986 Silvanus II.	990			997 Hugh Capet	996
973 Benedict VI.	974	990 Sergius II.	1019	1002 Henry the Lame	1004	996 Robert I.	
974 Benedict VII.	988						
988 John XIV.	994	1019 Eustathius	1025	1004 Conrad the Salic	1008		
994 Boniface VII., antipope (?)	985	1025 Alexius	1043				
985 John XV.	996	1043 Michael Cerularius	1059	1008 Henry III.	1056		
996 Gregory V.	999						
999 Silvester II.	1003						
1003 John XVII.	1008						
1008 John XVIII.	1009						
1009 Sergius IV.	1013						
1013 Benedict VIII.	1024						
1024 John XIX.	1028						
1028 Benedict IX.	1043						
1043 Silvester III., antipope	1046						
1046 Gregory VI.	1046						

## BOOK V.

## CHAPTER I.

## CHARLEMAGNE.

THE empire of Charlemagne was almost commensurate with Latin Christendom;\* England was the only large territory which acknowledged the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome, not in subjection to the Empire. Two powers held sway in Latin Christendom, the Emperor and the Pope: of these incomparably the greatest at this time was the Emperor. Charlemagne, with the appellation, assumed the full sovereignty of the Cæsars, united with the commanding vigour of a great Teutonic conqueror. Beyond the Alps he was a German sovereign, assembling in his Diet the whole nobility of the Romanised Teutonic nations, and bringing the still barbarous races by force under his yoke. In Italy he was a Northern Conqueror, though the ally of the Pope and of Rome. But he was likewise an Emperor attempting to organise his vast dominions with the comprehensive policy of Roman administration, though not without respect for Teutonic freedom. He was the sole legislator in ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs; the Carolinian institutions embrace the Church as well as the State; his Council at Frankfort dictates to the West, in despite of Papal remonstrances, on the great subject of image-worship. For centuries no monarch had stood so high, so alone, so unapproachable as Charlemagne. He ruled—ruled absolutely—by that strongest absolutism, the overawed or spontaneously consentient, cordially obedient, co-operative will of all other powers. He ruled

\* Compare limits of the empire of Charles.—Eginhard, Vit. Har. xv. He includes within it the whole of Italy, from Aosta to Lower Calabria.

from the Baltic to the Ebro, from the British Channel to the duchy of Benevento, even to the Straits of Messina. In personal dignity, who, it must not be said rivalled, approximated in the least degree, to Charlemagne? He had added, by his personal prowess in war, and this in a warlike age, by his unwearied activity, and by what success would glorify as military skill, almost all Germany, Spain to the Ebro, the kingdom of the Lombards, to the realm of the Franks, to Christendom. Huns, Avars, Slavians, tribes of unknown name and descent, had been repelled or subdued. His one defeat, that of Roncesvalles, is only great in recent poetry.<sup>b</sup> Every rebel, the independent German princes, like Tassilo of Bavaria, had been crushed; the obstinate Saxon, pursued to the court of the Danish King, at last became a subject and a Christian. On the Byzantine throne had sat an iconoclastic heretic, a boy, and a woman a murderess. Hadrian, during his long pontificate, had worn the Papal tiara with majesty. His successor, maimed and maltreated, had fallen to implore protection before the throne of Charlemagne; he had been obliged to clear himself of enormous crimes, to purge himself by oath before what seemed to all the superior tribunal of the Emperor. The gift of the Imperial crown had been the flattering homage of a grateful subject, somewhat loftily and disdainfully received; the donations of Charlemagne to the Pope were the prodigal but spontaneous alms of a religious King to the Church which he condescended to protect—free grants, or the recognition of grants from his pious ancestors.

Nor was it on signal occasions only that Charlemagne interfered in the affairs of the Church. His all comprehending, all pervading, all compelling administration was equally and constantly felt by his ecclesiastical as by his civil subjects. The royal commissioners inspected the conduct, reported on the lives, fixed and defined the duties, settled the tenure of property and its obligations, determined and apportioned the revenues of the religious as

<sup>b</sup> See in H. Martin, *Histoire de France*, ii. p. 373, the very curious and spirited song (from a French historic periodical), called the *Chant d'Altabigar*, said to

have been preserved from the ninth or tenth century among the Pyrenean mountaineers.

well as the temporal hierarchy. The formularies of the Empire are the legal and authorised rules to bishops and abbots as to nobles and knights. The ecclesiastical unity is but a subordinate branch of the temporal unity. The State, the Empire, not the Church, is during the reign of Charlemagne a supreme unresisted autocracy. Later romance has fallen below rather than heightened the full reality of his power and authority.

But it was only during his long indeed, but transitory reign. For the power of Charlemagne was altogether personal, and therefore unenduring: it His power personal. belonged to the man, to the conqueror, to the legislator, to the patron of letters and arts, to Charles the Great. At his death the Empire inevitably fell to pieces, only to be reunited occasionally and partially by some one great successor like Otho I., or some great house like that of Swabia. It was the first and last successful attempt to consolidate, under one vast empire, the Teutonic and Roman races, the nations of pure German origin and those whose languages showed the predominance of the Roman descent. It had its inherent elements of anarchy and of weakness in the first principles of the Teutonic character, the independence of the separate races, the vague notions of succession, which fluctuated between elective and hereditary sovereignty, with the evils of both; the Empire transmitted into feeble hands by inheritance, or elections contested by one-half of the Empire; above all, in the ages immediately following Charlemagne, the separation of the Empire into independent kingdoms, which became the appanages of several sons, in general the most deadly enemies to each other. It was no longer, it could not be, a single realm united by one wide-embracing administration, but a system of hostile and conflicting states, of which the boundaries, the powers, the wealth, the resources, were in incessant change and vicissitude.

The Papacy must await its time, a time almost certain to arrive. The Papacy, too, had its own source of weakness, the want of a settled and authoritative elective body. The Papacy. It had its periods of anarchy, of menaced—it might seem, at the close of the tenth century,

inevitable—dissolution. But it depended not on the sudden and accidental rise of great men to its throne. It knew no minorities, no divisions or subdivisions of its power between heirs of coequal and therefore conflicting rights. It was a succession of mature men; and the interests of the higher ranks of its subjects, of the hierarchy, even of the great ecclesiastical potentates throughout the West, were so bound up with his own that the Pope had not to strive against sovereigns as powerful as himself. Till the times of the anti-popes the papal power, though often obscured, especially in Rome itself, appeared to the world as one and indivisible. Its action was almost uniform; at least it had all the steadiness and inflexibility of a despotism—a despotism, if not of force, of influence, or of sympathy, and of cordial concurrence among all its multifarious agencies throughout the world to its aggrandisement.

But the empire of Charlemagne, as being the great epoch in the annals of Latin Christendom, demands more full consideration. Out of his universal Empire in the West and out of his Institutes rose, to a great degree, the universal empire of the Church and the whole mediæval polity; feudalism itself. Western Europe became, as it were, one through his conquests, which gathered within its frontiers all the races of Teutonic origin (except the formidable Northmen, or Normans, who, after endangering its existence, or at least menacing the re-barbarising of many of its kingdoms, were to be the founders of kingdoms within its pale), and those conquests even encroached on some tribes of Slavian descent. It became a world within the world; on more than one side bordered by Mohammedanism, on one by the hardly less foreign Byzantine Empire. The history, therefore, of Latin Christianity must survey the character of the founder of this Empire, the extent of his dominions, his civil as well as his ecclesiastical institutes. As yet we have only traced him in his Italian conquests, as the ally and protector of the Popes. He must be seen as the sovereign and law-giver of Transalpine as well as of Cisalpine Europe.\*

Karl, according to his German appellation, was the model of a Teutonic chieftain, in his gigantic stature,

\* Eginhard, *Vit. Car.* sub fine.

enormous strength, and indefatigable activity; temperate, in diet, and superior to the barbarous vice of drunkenness. Hunting and war were his chief <sup>The character of Charlemagne.</sup> occupations; and his wars were carried on with all the ferocity of encountering savage tribes. But he was likewise a Roman Emperor, not merely in his vast and organising policy: he had that one vice of the old Roman civilisation which the Merovingian kings had indulged, though not perhaps with more unbounded lawlessness. The religious Emperor, in one respect, troubled not himself with the restraints of religion. The humble or grateful Church beheld meekly, and almost without remonstrance, the irregularity of domestic life, which not merely indulged in free licence, but treated the sacred rite of marriage as a covenant dissoluble at his pleasure. Once we have heard, and but once, the Church raise its authoritative, its comminatory voice, and that not to forbid the King of the Franks from wedding a second wife while his first was alive, but from marrying a Lombard princess. One pious ecclesiastic alone in his dominions, he a relative, ventured to protest aloud. Charles repudiated his first wife to marry the daughter of Desiderius; and after a year repudiated her to marry Hildegard, a Swabian lady. By Hildegard he had six children. On her death he married Fastrada, who bore him two; a nameless concubine another. On Fastrada's death he married Liutgardis, a German, who died without issue. On her decease he was content with four concubines.<sup>d</sup> A darker suspicion, arising out of the loose character of his daughters, none of whom he allowed to marry, but carried them about with him to the camp as well as the court, has been insinuated, but without the least warrant from history. Under the same double character of the Teutonic and the Roman Emperor, Charlemagne introduced Roman arts and civilisation into the remoter parts of his dominions. Aix-la-Chapelle, his capital, became, in buildings and in the marble and mosaic decorations of his palace, a Roman city, in which Karl sat in the midst of his Teutonic Diet. The patron of Latin

<sup>d</sup> The reading is doubtful. Bouquet has *quatuor*. Pertz has followed a MS. which gives three.

letters, the friend of Alcuin, encouraged the compilation of a grammar in the language of his Teutonic subjects. The hero of the Saxon poet's Latin hexameter panegyric collected the old bardic lays of Germany. Even Charlemagne's fierce wars bore Christianity and civilisation in their train.

The Saxon wars of Charlemagne, which added almost the whole of Germany to his dominions, were Saxon wars. avowedly religious wars. If Boniface was the Christian, Charlemagne was the Mohammedan, Apostle of the Gospel. The declared object of his invasions, according to his biographer, was the extinction of heathenism;<sup>e</sup> subjection to the Christian faith or extermination.<sup>f</sup> Baptism was the sign of subjugation and fealty: the Saxons accepted or threw it off according as they were in a state of submission or of revolt. These wars were inevitable; they were but the continuance of the great strife waged for centuries from the barbarous North and East, against the civilised South and West; only that the Roman and Christian population, now invigorated by the large infusion of Teutonic blood, instead of awaiting aggression, had become the aggressor. The tide of conquest was rolling back; the subjects of the Western kingdoms, of the Western Empire, instead of waiting to see their homes overrun by hordes of fierce invaders, now boldly marched into the heart of their enemies' country, penetrated their forests, crossed their morasses, and planted their feudal courts of justice, their churches, and their monasteries in the most remote and savage regions, up to the Elbe and the shores of the Baltic.

The Saxon race now occupied the whole North of Germany, from the Baltic along the whole Eastern The Saxons. frontier of the Frankish kingdom. The interior of the land was yet an unknown world, both as to extent and population. Vast forests, in which it was said that

<sup>e</sup> Some of the heathen Frisian temples appear to have contained much wealth. St. Luidger was sent out to destroy some. His followers brought back a considerable treasure, which they found in the temples. Charlemagne took two-thirds,

and gave one to the Church.—Vit. S. Luidg. apud Pertz. ii. p. 408.

<sup>f</sup> "Eo usque perseverant, dum aut victi Christianæ religioni subjecerentur aut omnino tollerentur."—Eginhard, sub ann. 775.

squirrels might range for leagues without dropping to the ground,<sup>a</sup> broken only by wide heaths, sandy moors, and swamps, were peopled by swarms which still were thought inexhaustible. These countless hosts, which seemed but the first wave of a yet undiminished flood, might still precipitate themselves or be precipitated by the impulse of nations from the further North or East, on the old Roman empire and the advanced settlements beyond the Rhine. The Saxons were divided into three leading tribes, the Ostphalians, the Westphalians, and the Angarians; but each clan or village maintained its independence, waged war, or made peace. Each clan, according to old Teutonic usage, consisted of nobles, freemen, and slaves; but at times the whole nation met in a great armed convention. A deadly hatred had grown up between the Franks and Saxons, inevitable between two warlike and restless races, separated by a doubtful and unmarked border, on vast level plains, with no natural boundary, dense forests, a chain of mountains, or any large river or lake.<sup>b</sup> The Saxons were not likely, when an opportunity of plunder or even of daring adventure might offer itself, to respect the frontier of their more civilised neighbours, or the Franks to abstain from advancing their own limits wherever the land offered any advantage, for a military, commercial, or even religious outpost. But it was not merely this casual hostility of two adventurous and unquiet people, encountering on a long and doubtful border—the Saxons scorned and detested the Romanised Franks, the Franks held the Saxons to be barbarians and heathens. The Saxons no doubt saw in the earlier and peaceful Christian missionaries the agents of Frankish as well as of Christian conquest; even where their own religion hung so loosely on their minds, they could not but be suspicious of foreigners who began by undermining their national faith, and might end in endangering the national independence. They beheld with impatience and jealousy the

<sup>a</sup> Vit. S. Lebuini.

<sup>b</sup> "Suberant et causæ, quæ quotidie pacem conturbare poterant, termini videlicet nostri et illorum pæne ubique in plano contigui, præter pauca loca in

quibus, vel silvæ majores, vel montium juga interjecta utrorumque agros certo limite disternant, et rapinæ et incendia vicissim fieri non cessabant."—Eginhard, Vit. Carol. cvii.

churches and monasteries, which gradually rose near to, upon, and within their frontier; though probably the connection of the missionaries with the Romanised Franks, rather than the religion itself, which otherwise they might have admitted with the usual indifference of barbarians, principally excited their animosity.

The first expedition of Charlemagne against the Saxons before his Lombard conquest arose out of religion. First Saxon invasion. A.D. 772. Among the English missionaries who, no doubt from speaking a kindred language, were so successful among the Teutonic tribes, was St. Lebuin, a man of the most intrepid zeal. Though the oratory which he had built on the Saxon bank of the Ysell had been burned by the Saxons, he determined to confront the whole assembled nation in their great diet on the Weser. Charles was holding at the same time his Field of May at Worms: this Saxon diet might be a great national council to watch or obtain intelligence of his proceedings.<sup>1</sup> The Saxons were in the act of solemn worship and sacrifice, when Lebuin stood up in the midst, proclaimed himself the messenger of the one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and denounced the folly and impiety of their idolatries.<sup>2</sup> He urged them to repentance, to belief, to baptism, and promised as their reward temporal and eternal peace. So far the Saxons seem to have listened with decent or awe-struck reverence; but when Lebuin ceased to speak in this more peaceful tone, and declared that, if they refused to obey, God would send against them a mighty and unconquerable King who would punish their contumacy, lay waste their land with fire and sword, and make slaves of their wives and children, the proud barbarians broke out into the utmost fury; they threatened the dauntless missionary with stakes and stones: his life was saved only by the intervention of an aged chieftain. The old man insisted on the sanctity which belonged to all ambassadors, above all the ambassadors of a great God.

The acts and language of Charles showed that he warred at once against the religion and the freedom of ancient

<sup>1</sup> May, however, was probably the usual month for the German national assemblies.

<sup>2</sup> Vit. S. Lebuini, apud Pertz.

Germany. Assembling his army at Worms, he crossed the Rhine, and marched upon the Eresburg, a strong fortress near the Drimel.<sup>m</sup> Having taken this, <sup>The Irminsul.</sup> he advanced to a kind of religious capital, either of the whole Saxon nation or at least of the more considerable tribes. It was situated near the source of the Lippe,<sup>n</sup> and contained the celebrated idol, the Irmin-Saule.<sup>o</sup>

This may have been simply the great pillar, the trunk of a gigantic tree, consecrated by immemorial reverence, or the name may imply the war-god, or the parental-god or demi-god of the race. This notion suits better with the simpler description of the idol in the older writers. This rude and perhaps, therefore, not less imposing idol, has been exalted into a great symbolic image, either of the national deity or of the nation, arrayed in fanciful attributes, which seem to belong to a later mythology;<sup>p</sup> and German patriotism has delighted to recognise in this image consecrated by the Teutonic worship, that of the great Teutonic hero, Herman, the conqueror of Varus. Throughout the neighbourhood the names of places are said to bear frequent and manifest allusion to this great victory over Rome,—the field of victory, the stream of blood, the stream of the bones. Not far off is the field of Rome, the mountain of Arminius, the forest of Varus.<sup>q</sup>

But whether rude and shapeless trunk, or symbolic image of the Saxon god, or the statue of the Teutonic hero, the Irmin-Saule fell by the remorseless hands of the Christian Frank.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>m</sup> Supposed Stadbergen, in the bishopric of Paderborn.

<sup>n</sup> Eckhart (Pertz, p. 151) says distinctly that it was some way beyond the Eresburg.

<sup>o</sup> Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, 81 et seq. 208 et seq., "Irmānsaul, colossus, altissima columna." He quotes Rudolf of Fulda: "Truncum quoque ligni non parvæ magnitudinis in altum erectum sub divo colebant, patriâ eum linguâ Irminsul appellantes, quod Latine dicitur universalis columna, quasi sustinens omnia." Yet Irmin seems to have been the name of a national god or demigod.

<sup>p</sup> He was clothed in armour; his feet rested on a field of flowers; in his right hand he held a banner with a rose in the centre, in his left a balance; on his

buckler was a lion commanding other animals.—Spelman, in *Irminsul*.

<sup>q</sup> The neighbourhood of Dethmold abounds with these sacred reminiscences. At the foot of the Teutberg is Wintfield, the field of victory; the Rodenbach, the stream of blood; and the Knochenbach, where the bones of the followers of Varus were found. Feldrom, the field of the Romans, is at no great distance. Rather farther off, near Pymont, Hermansberg, the mountain of Arminius; and on the banks of the Weser, Varenholz, the wood of Varus.—Stapfer, art. Arminius, in *Biograph. Universelle*.

<sup>r</sup> Luden is indignant at the destruction of this monument of German freedom by the renegade Charlemagne.—*Geschichte*, iv. p. 234.

The war of the Franks and the Saxons lasted for thirty-three years;<sup>\*</sup> it had all the horrors of an internecine strife between two hordes of barbarians. The armies of Charles were almost always masters of the field; but no sooner were they withdrawn than the indefatigable Saxons rose again, burst through the encroaching limits of the Empire, and often reached its more peaceful settlements. Hardly more than two years after the capture of Eresburg, and of their more sacred place, the site of the Irman-Saule, they revenged the destruction of their great idol by burning, or attempting to burn, the church in Fritzlar, founded by St. Boniface. It was said to have been saved by the miraculous appearance of two angels in white garments; possibly two of the younger ecclesiastics.<sup>†</sup> In their inroads they respected neither age, nor sex, nor order, nor sacred edifice; all was wrapped in one blaze of fire, in one deluge of blood; but their especial fury was directed against the monasteries and churches. Widekind, the hero of these earlier exploits, was no less deadly an enemy of Christianity than of the Franks. He began his career by destroying all the Christian settlements in Friesland, and restoring the whole land to heathenism.<sup>‡</sup>

The historians of Charlemagne denounce the perfidy of the Saxons to the most solemn engagements; but in fact there was no supreme government which had the power or could be answerable for the fulfilment of treaties. Each village had its chieftain and its freemen, independent of the rest; the tribes whose land Charles occupied, or whose forests he menaced, submitted to the yoke, but those beyond them held themselves in no way bound by such treaties.<sup>§</sup>

After a few years, at a great Diet at Paderborn, the

<sup>\*</sup> From 772 to 805.

<sup>†</sup> Ann. Franc., A.D. 774, Bouquet, p. 19.

<sup>‡</sup> The Saxon Campaigns, according to Boehmer Regesta: 1. Taking of Eresburg, A.D. 772. 2. Charlemagne crosses the Weser, Aug. 776. 3. To the Lippe, 776. 4. Diet of Paderborn, 777. 5. Revolt of Saxons, who waste as far as the Moselle, 778. 6. Advance to the Weser, 779. 7. To the Elbe, 780. 8. Diet at Lippe Brunnen. 9. Capitulation of the

Saxons, 782. 10. Great victory at Thietmar, 783. 11. Re-advance to the Elbe. 12. Further campaign, 784. 13. Widekind surrenders, and is baptised, 785. There were, however, later insurrections, and later progresses of Charlemagne through the subjugated land.

<sup>§</sup> "Quæ nec rege fuit saltem sociata sub uno  
Ut se militibus pariter defenderet usu,  
Sed varis divisa modis plebs omnis habebat  
Quot pagos tot pæne duces."

*Poeta Saxo*, ad ann. 772, v. 24.

whole nation seemed to obey the summons of Charles to acknowledge him as their liege lord. Multitudes were baptised; and all the more considerable tribes gave hostages for their peaceful conduct. Yet but two years after, on the news of Charlemagne's defeat at Roncesvalles, they appeared again in arms, with the indefatigable Widekind at their head: he alone had kept aloof from the Diet at Paderborn, having taken refuge, it was said, with the King of Denmark, no doubt beyond the Elbe. Notwithstanding their baptism and the hostages, they reached the Rhine, ravaging as they went, threatened Cologne from Deutz, were only prevented from invading France by the difficulty of crossing the river; along its right bank they burned and slaughtered from Cologne to Coblenz. This sudden outburst was followed by the most formidable revolt, put down by Charles's victories at Detmold and near the river Hase. Throughout the war Charlemagne endeavoured to subdue the tribes as he went on by the terror of his arms; and terrible indeed were those arms! On one occasion, at Verdun-on-the-Allier, he massacred 4000 brave warriors who had surrendered, in cold blood. Nor did he trust to the humanising influence of Christianity alone, but to the diffusion of Roman manners, and what might appear Roman luxury. The more submissive chieftains he tried to attach to his person by honours and by presents. The poor Saxons first became acquainted with the produce of wealthy Gaul. To some he gave farms, whence they were tempted and enabled to purchase splendid dresses, learned the use of money, the pleasures of wine.<sup>7</sup>

His frontier gradually advanced: in his first expedition he had crossed the Drimel and the Lippe, and reached the Weser; but twelve years of alternate victory and revolt had passed before he arrived at the Elbe; in four years more, during which Widekind himself submitted to baptism, although the unquiet people still renewed their revolt, he reached the sea, the limit of the Saxon territory.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> "Prædia præstiterat cum rex compluribus illis  
Ex quibus acciperent pretiosæ tegmina vestis,  
Argenti cumulos, dulcisque fluent Lyxel."  
*Porta Saxo*, iv. 130.

<sup>8</sup> "Usque ad oceanum trans omnes  
paludes et invia loca transitum est."—  
*Ann. Tiliac. sub ann.*

Diet at  
Paderborn.  
A.D. 777.

A.D. 778.

A.D. 779.

The policy of Charlemagne in the establishment of Christianity in the remote parts of Germany was perhaps wisely incongruous. Though wars of religion, they were waged entirely by the secular arm. He encouraged no martial Prelate to appear at the head of his vassals, or to join in the work of bloodshed. On no point are his edicts more strong, more frequent, or more precise, than in prohibiting the clergy from bearing arms, or joining any military expedition.\* They followed in the wake of war, but did not mingle in it. A few priests only remained with the camp to perform divine service, and to offer ministrations to the soldiers. The religion, though forced upon the conquered, though baptism was the only security (a precarious security, as it often proved) which the conqueror would accept for the submission of the vanquished, yet this was part of the treaty of peace, and as a pledge of peace was fitly performed by the ministers of peace. The conquest was complete, the carnage over, before the priests were summoned to their office to baptize the multitudes, who submitted to it as the chance of war, as they would to the surrender of property or of personal freedom. For this baptism no preparation was deemed necessary; the barbarians assented by thousands to the creed, and were immediately immersed or sprinkled with the regenerating waters. The clergy on the other hand were exposed to the fury of the insurgent people on every revolt: to hew down the crosses was the first sign that the Saxons renounced allegiance, and baptism was, according to their notion, cancelled by the renunciation of allegiance.

The subjugation of the land appeared complete before Charlemagne founded successively his great religious colonies, the eight bishoprics of Minden, Seligenstadt, Verden, Bremen,<sup>b</sup> Munster, Hildesheim, Osnaburg, and Paderborn. These, with many richly-

Establishment  
of Christianity.

Foundations  
of bishop-  
rics and  
monasteries.

\* "*Hortatu omnium fidelium nos-  
trorum et maxime episcoporum et reli-  
quorum sacerdotum consultu, servis Dei  
per omnia omnibus armaturam portare  
vel pugnare, aut in exercitum et in  
hostem pergere, omnino prohibemus,  
nisi illi tantummodo qui propter divinum  
ministerium.*"—Carolo. M. Capit. Ge-

neral. A.D. 769. Carloman, A.D. 742,  
Pepin, 744, had made similar enact-  
ments; but it appears that the restraint  
was unwelcome to some of the more  
warlike of the order. Charlemagne was  
supposed to detract from their dignity  
by prohibiting them from bearing arms.  
<sup>b</sup> Bremen, founded July 14, 787.

endowed monasteries like Hersfield, became the separate centres from which Christianity and civilisation spread in expanding circles. But though these were military as well as religious settlements, the ecclesiastics were the only foreigners. The more faithful and trustworthy Saxon chieftains, who gave the security of seemingly sincere conversion to Christianity, were raised into Counts; thus the profession of Christianity was the sole test of fealty. The Saxon remained a conquered, but in some respects an independent nation; it was ruled by a feudal nobility and a feudal hierarchy. The Saxons paid no tribute to the Empire: Charlemagne was content with their payment of tithes to the clergy,—a part of his ecclesiastical system, which was extended throughout his Transalpine dominions. Yet even after this period another great general insurrection broke out while Charles was engaged in a war with the Avars, the churches were destroyed, dreadful ravages committed. The revolt arose partly from the severe avarice with which the clergy exacted their tithes, and the impatience of the rude Germans at this unusual taxation. It was not till ten thousand men had been transplanted from the banks of the Elbe into France that the contest came to an end. The gratitude of the Saxon poet, who wrote under the Emperor Arnulf, for the conversion of his ancestors to Christianity, dwells but slightly on the sanguinary means used for their conversion, and their obstinate resistance to his persuasive sword.<sup>c</sup> On the day of judgment, when the Apostles render an account of the nations which they have converted, when Charlemagne is followed into heaven by the hosts of his Saxon proselytes, the poet expresses his humble hope that he may be admitted in the train.

Charlemagne, in Christian history, commands a more important station even than for his subjugation of Germany to the Gospel, on account of his complete organisation, if not foundation, of the high feudal hierarchy in great part of Europe. Throughout the Western Empire was, it may be said, constitutionally

<sup>c</sup> "Tum Carolum gaudens Saxonum turba  
sequatur,  
Illi perpetuus gloria lætitiæ ;

O utinam vel cunctorum sequar ultimos  
horum."—v. 685.

established this double aristocracy, ecclesiastical and civil. Everywhere the higher clergy and the nobles, and so downwards through the different gradations of society, were of the same rank, liable to many of the same duties, of equal, in some cases of co-ordinate, authority. Each district had its Bishop and its Count; the dioceses and counties were mostly of the same extent. They held for some purposes common courts, for others had separate jurisdiction, but of co-equal power.

At the summit of each social pyramid, which rose by the same steps from the common base, the vast servile class, which each ruled with the right of master and possessor, or that of serfs attached to the soil, which were gradually succeeding to the baser and more wretched slavery of the Roman Empire,<sup>d</sup> stood the Sovrans, the Emperor, and the Pope. So at least it was in later times. At present Charlemagne stood alone on his unapproachable height. As monarch of the Franks, as King of Italy, still more as Emperor of the West, he was supreme, the Pope his humble grateful subject. Charlemagne, with the title, assumed the imperial power of a Theodosius or a Justinian. His legislation embraces ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs. In the general assembly, of which, with the nobles, they were constituent parts, the assent of the bishops may be expressed or implied; but the laws which fix the obligations, the revenues, even the duties of the clergy, are issued in the name of the Emperor: they are monarchical and imperial, not papal or synodical canons. Already, indeed, the principles on which the loftier pretensions of the Church were hereafter to be grounded, had crept imperceptibly in under the specious form of religious ceremonies. The very title to the Frankish monarchy, the Empire itself, had to the popular view something of a papal gift. The anointing of the Kings of France had become almost necessary for the full popular recognition of the royal title.<sup>e</sup> The part taken by the

<sup>d</sup> On the slow and gradual transition from slavery to serfdom and villeinage, see Mr. Hallam's supplemental note 79, and the remarkable quotation from M. Guérard.

<sup>e</sup> The Old Testament, which had sug-

gested and sanctioned this ceremony, had become of equal authority with the New. The head of the Church was not merely the successor of the chief apostle. He was the high priest of the old Law, Samuel or Joas as well as St. Peter.

Pope in the offer of the Empire to Charlemagne, his coronation by the hands of the Pope in the same manner, gave a vague notion, a notion to be matured by time, that it was a Papal grant. He who could bestow could withhold; and, as it was afterwards maintained, he who could elevate could degrade; he who could crown could dis-crown the Emperor.

But over the Transalpine clergy, Charlemagne had not only the general authority of a Teutonic monarch and a Roman Emperor, he had likewise the same feudal sovereignty, founded on the same principles, which he had over the secular nobility. Their estates were held on the same tenure; they had been invested in them, especially in Germany, according to the old Teutonic law of conquest. Every conquered territory, or a portion of it, became the possession of the conquerors; it was a vast farm, granted out in lots, on certain conditions; the king reserved certain portions as the royal domain, others were granted to the warriors (the leudes), under the title first of allodes, which gradually became benefices.<sup>f</sup> But bishoprics and abbacies were originally, or became, in the strictest sense benefices. The great ecclesiastics took the same oath with other vassals on a change of sovereign. They were bound, bishops, abbots and abbesses, to appear at the Herr-bann of the sovereign. Charlemagne submits them without distinction to the visitation of his officers, who are to make inquest as to their due performance of their duties as beneficiaries, the maintenance not merely of the secular buildings, but also of the churches, and the due solemnization of the divine offices.<sup>g</sup> The men of the church were bound to obey the

Authority of  
Charlemagne.

Transalpine  
hierarchy.

<sup>f</sup> French learning, especially that of M. Guizot, of M. Lehuierou, and of the authors of the prefaces to the valuable volumes of the 'Documents Inédits,' has exhausted every subject relating to the national and social institutions of the prefeudal and feudal times; the ranks and orders of men; the growth of the cities; their guilds and privileges; the particular tenure and obligations of laud. Mr. Hallam has diligently watched, and in his supplemental notes summed up with his characteristic strong English

sense and fairness, the results of all these vast and voluminous inquiries; not only those of France, but those of Belgium, England, Italy, Germany.

<sup>g</sup> "Volumus atque jubemus ut missi nostri per singulos pagos prævidere studeant omnia beneficia quæ nostri et aliorum homines habere videntur, quomodo restaurata sint post annuntiationem nostram sive destructa. Primum de ecclesiis, quomodo structæ aut destructæ sint in tectis, in maceris, sive parietibus, sive in pavementis, necnon

summons to military service, as duly as any other liegemen, only that they marched under a lay captain. The same number were allowed to stay at home to cultivate the land. The great prelates, even in the days of Charlemagne, resisted the laws which prohibited their appearing in war at the head of their own troops, as lowering their dignity, and depriving the Church of some of its honours.<sup>b</sup> Bishops and abbots, in return for the oath of protection from the sovereign, took an oath of fealty as counsellors and as aids to the sovereign; but the great proof of this ecclesiastical vassalage is that they were amenable to the law of treason, were deposed as guilty of violating their allegiance.<sup>1</sup>

Charlemagne himself was no less prodigal than weaker kings of immunities and grants of property to churches and monasteries. With his queen Hildegard he endows the church of St. Martin, in Tours, with lands in Italy. His grants to St. Denys, to Lorch, to Fulda, to Prum, more particularly to Hersfeld, and many Italian abbeys, appear among the acts of his reign.<sup>k</sup>

Nor were these estates always obtained from the pious generosity of the king or the nobles. The stewards of the poor were sometimes the spoilers of the poor. Even under Charlemagne there are complaints against the usurpation of property by bishops and abbots, as against counts and laymen. They compelled the poor free man to sell his property, or forced him to serve in the army, and that on

in picturâ, etiam in luminariis, sive officiis. Similiter et alia beneficia, casas cum omnibus appendiciis eorum."—K. Magn. Cap. Aquense, A.D. 807; Lehuierou, p. 517.

<sup>b</sup> "Quia instigante antiquo hoste audivimus quosdam nos suspectos habere propterea quod concessimus episcopis et sacerdotibus ac reliquis Dei servis ut in hostes . . . non irent . . . nec agitatores sanguinum fierent . . . quod honores sacerdotum et res ecclesiarum auferre vel minuere voluissemus."—Cap. Incert. Ann.; Lehuierou, 520.

<sup>1</sup> "Promitto et perdono vobis . . . defensionem, quantum potero, adjuvante Domino, exhibebo . . . ut vos mihi secundum Deum et secundum sæculum sic fideles adjutores et consilio et auxilio sitis sicut vestri antecessores boni meis melioribus prædecessoribus extiterunt."

—Promiss. Dom. Karlomanni regis, A.D. 882; Lehuierou, p. 519. Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, was deposed as traitor to Louis the Debonnaire; Tertoldus, Bishop of Bayeux, was accused of treason against Charles the Bald.—Bouquet.

<sup>k</sup> See the Regesta in Boehmer, *passim*. Lehuierou (p. 539) gives an instance of the enormous possessions of some of the monasteries: they were larger in the north than in the south of France (compare Thierry, *Temps Mérovingiens*). The abbey of S. Wandrille, or Fontenelle, according to its chartulary, owned, less than 150 years after its foundation (A.D. 650-788), 3974 manses (the manse contained 12 jugera, acres), besides mills and other property. Compare the lands heaped on churches and monasteries by the Merovingians, page 221.

permanent or continual duty, and so to leave his land either without owner, with all the chances that he might not return, or to commit it to the custody of those who remained at home in quiet and seized every opportunity of entering into possession.<sup>m</sup> No Naboth's vineyard escaped their watchful avarice.

In their fiefs the bishop or abbot exercised all the rights of a feudal chieftain. At first, like all seignorial privileges, their administration was limited, and with appeal to a higher court, or in the last resort, to the king. Gradually, sometimes by silent usurpation, sometimes by actual grant, they acquired power over all causes and all persons. The right of appeal, if it existed, was difficult to exercise, was curtailed, or fell into desuetude.<sup>n</sup>

Thus the hierarchy, now a feudal institution, parallel to and co-ordinate with the temporal feudal aristocracy, aspired to enjoy, and actually before long did enjoy, the dignity, the wealth, the power, of suzerain lords. Bishops and abbots had the independence and privileges of inalienable fiefs; and at the same time began either sullenly to contest, or haughtily to refuse, those payments, or acknowledgments of vassalage, which sometimes weighed heavily on other lands. During the reign of Charlemagne this theory of spiritual immunity slumbered, or rather had not quickened into life. It was boldly (so rapid was its growth) announced in the strife with his son, Louis the Pious. It was then asserted by the hierarchy (become king-makers and king-deposers) that all property given to the Church, to the poor, and to the servants of God, or rather to the saints, to God himself (such were the specious phrases) was given absolutely, irrevocably, with no reserve. The

<sup>m</sup> "Quod pauperes se reclamant expoliatos esse de eorum proprietate; et hoc æqualiter supra episcopos et abbates et eorum advocatos et supra comites et eorum centenarios. . . . Dicunt etiam quod quicunque proprium suum episcopo, abbati, comiti aut judici . . . dare noluerit, occasiones querunt super illum pauperem, quomodo eum condemnare possint, et illum semper in hostem faciant ire, usque dum pauper factus, volens nolens suum proprium aut tradat aut vendat; alii vero qui traditum

habent, abaque ullius inquietudine domi resideant."—Kar. M. Capit. de Exped. Exercit., A.D. 811. Compare Capit. Longobard. ap. Pertz, iii. p. 192, and Lehuierou, p. 311.

<sup>n</sup> Compare the luminous discussion of Lehuierou, p. 243, *et seq.* The right of basse justice was inseparable from property. The bishop or abbot was head of the family; all were in his mundium. He afterwards acquired moyenne, finally haute justice. In the cities he became chief magistrate by another process.

king might have power over knight's fees, over those of the Church he had none whatever. Such claims were impious, sacrilegious, and implied forfeiture of eternal life. The clergy and their estates belonged to another realm, to another commonwealth; they were entirely, absolutely independent of the civil power. The clergy belonged to the Herr-bann of Christ, and of Christ alone.<sup>o</sup>

These estates, however, thus sooner or later held by feudal tenure, and liable to feudal service, were the aristocratic possessions of the ecclesiastical aristocracy; on the whole body of the clergy Charlemagne bestowed their even more vast dowry—the legal claim to tithes.<sup>p</sup> Already, under the Merovingians, the clergy had given significant hints that the law of Leviticus was the perpetual and un-repealed law of God.<sup>q</sup> Pepin had commanded the payment of tithe for the celebration of peculiar litanies during a period of famine.<sup>r</sup> Charlemagne made it a law of the Empire: he enacted it in its most strict and comprehensive form, as investing the clergy in a right to the tenth of the substance and of the labour alike of freeman and of serf.<sup>s</sup> The collection of tithe was regulated by compulsory statutes; the clergy took note of all who paid or refused to pay; <sup>t</sup> four, or eight, or more jurymen were summoned from each parish, as witnesses for the claims disputed; <sup>u</sup> the contumacious were three times summoned; if still obstinate, excluded from the church; if they still refused to pay, they were fined over and above the whole tithe, six solidi; if further contumacious, the recusant's house was shut up; if he attempted to enter it, he was cast into prison, to await the judgment of the next

<sup>o</sup> "Quod semel legitime consecratum est Deo, in suis militibus, et pauperibus ad usus militiæ suæ libere concedatur. Habeat igitur Rex rempublicam libere in usibus militiæ suæ ad dispensandum; habeat et Christus res ecclesiarum quasi alteram rempublicam, omnium indigentium et sibi servantium usibus. . . Sin alias ut apostolus ait, qui aliena diripiunt, regnum non possidebunt eternum. Quanto magis qui ea quæ Dei sunt et ecclesiarum defraudantur, in quibus sacrilegiacopulantur."—Vit. Walæ, apud Pertz. Walæ's doctrines were not unopposed. Compare Lehuereu, p. 538.

<sup>p</sup> On Tithes, see Planck, ii. pp. 402 and 411.

<sup>q</sup> Sirmond. Concil. Eccles. Gall. i. p. 543; Council of Macon, A.D. 585.

<sup>r</sup> Peppini Regis Capitul. A.D. 764.

<sup>s</sup> "Similiter secundum Dei mandatum præcipimus ut omnes decimam partem suis ecclesiis et sacerdotibus donent, tam nobiles quam ingenui, similiter et liti."—Capit. Paderborn. A.D. 785. See also Cap. A.D. 779. It was confirmed by the Council of Frankfort, Capitul. Frankfurtense, A.D. 794.

<sup>t</sup> Capit. Aquisgran. A.D. 801.

<sup>u</sup> Capitul. Longobard. A.D. 803.

plea of the crown ; \* the tithe was due on all produce, even on animals.<sup>7</sup> The tithe was usually divided into three portions—one for the maintenance of the Church, the second for the Poor, the third for the Clergy. The bishop sometimes claimed a fourth. The bishop was the arbiter of the distribution : he assigned the necessary portion for the Church, and apportioned that of the clergy.<sup>8</sup> This tithe was by no means a spontaneous votive offering of the whole Christian people—it was a tax imposed by Imperial authority, enforced by Imperial power. It had caused one, if not more than one, sanguinary insurrection among the Saxons. It was submitted to in other parts of the Empire, not without strong reluctance.\*

But in return for this magnificent donation, Charlemagne assumed the power of legislating for the clergy Ecclesiastical laws of Charlemagne. with as full despotism as for the laity: in both cases there was the constitutional control of the concurrence of the nobles and of the higher ecclesiastics, strong against a feeble monarch, feeble against a sovereign of Charlemagne's overruling character. His Institutes are in the language of command to both branches of that great ecclesiastical militia, which he treated as his vassals, the secular and the monastic clergy.<sup>b</sup> He seemed to have a sagacious foresight of the dangers of his feudal hierarchical system ; the tendency still further to secularise the secular clergy ; the inclination to independence in the regulars,

\* Capitul. Longobard. A.D. 803, et Capitul. Hlotharii, i. 825, et Hludovici, ii. 875.

<sup>7</sup> Capitul. Aquisgran. 801.

<sup>8</sup> The tithe belonged to the parish church ; that in which alone baptisms were performed. But there was a constant struggle to alienate them to churches founded by the great landowners on their own domain, of which churches they retained the patronage. Charlemagne himself set a bad example in this respect, alienating the tithes to the succursal churches on his own domain.—Capitul. de Villis. Compare Lhuierou, p. 489.

<sup>a</sup> Even Alcuin ventures to suggest, that if the Apostles of Christ had demanded tithes they would not have been so successful in the propagation of the

Gospel:—"An Apostoli quoque ab ipso Christo edocti, et ad prædicandum mundo missi, exactiones decimarum exegissent . . . . considerandum est. Scimus quia decimatio substantiæ nostræ valde bona est ; sed melius est illam amittere quam fidem perdere. Nos vero in fide catholicâ nati, nutriti, edocti, vix consentimus substantiam nostram pleniter decimare. Quanto magis tenera fides et infantilis animus, et avara mens."—Alcuin, Epist. apud Bouquet, I. v. Compare a note of Weissenberg (Die grossen Kirchen Versammlungen, vol. i. p. 178), on some curious consequences of enforcing the law of tithes.

<sup>b</sup> See, on the kind of spiritual jurisdiction exercised by former kings of France, Ellendorf, i. 231.

which afterwards led to the rivalry and hostility between the two orders. The great Church fiefs would naturally be coveted by men of worldly views, seeking only their wealth and power, without discharging their high and sacred offices; they would become hereditary in certain families, or at least within a limited class of powerful claimants. Each separate benefice would be exposed to perpetual dilapidation by its successive holders; there was no efficient security against the illegal alienation of its estates to the family, kindred, or friends of the incumbent: ° it might be squandered in war by a martial, in magnificence by a princely, in rude voluptuousness by a dissolute prelate.<sup>d</sup> Charlemagne endeavoured to bring the great monastic rule of mutual control to hallow the lives and secure the property of the clergy. The scheme of St. Augustine, that the clergy should live in common, under canonical rule, and under the immediate control and superintendence of the Bishop, had never been entirely obsolete. Charlemagne endeavoured to marshal the whole secular clergy under this severe discipline; he would have all either under canonical or monastic discipline.<sup>e</sup> But the legislator passed his statutes in vain; rich chapters were founded, into which the secular spirit entered in other forms; the great mass of the clergy continued to lead their separate lives, under no other control than the more or less vigilant rule of the Bishop.

Charlemagne endeavoured with equal want of success to prevent the monastic establishments from growing up into separate independent republics, bound only by their own rules, and without the pale of the episcopal or even metropolitan jurisdiction. The abbots and the monks were commanded to obey in all humility

The monasteries.

\* "Si sacerdotes plures uxores habuerint:" that probably means married more than once.—Caput. lib. i.

<sup>d</sup> There are many sumptuary provisions. Bishops, abbots, abbesses, are not to keep hounds, falcons, hawks, or jugglers. Drunkenness is forbidden, as well as certain oaths.

<sup>e</sup> "Qui ad clericatum accedunt, quod nos nominamus canonicam vitam vo-

lumus ut episcopus eorum regat vitam. Clerici—ut vel veri monachi sint vel veri canonici."—Capit. A.D. 780, 71 et 75. "Canonici . . . in domo episcopali vel etiam in monasterio . . . secundum canonicam vitam erudiantur." A.D. 802. *Ut omnes clerici unum de duobus eligant, aut pleniter secundum canonicam, aut secundum regularem institutionem vivere debeant.*" A.D. 805.

the mandates of their Bishops;† the abbot received his power within the walls of his convent from the hands of the Bishop; the doors of the monastery were to fly open to the Bishop; an appeal lay from the Bishop to the Metropolitan, from the Metropolitan to the Emperor.‡ The Bishops themselves too often granted full or partial immunities, which gradually grew into absolute exception from episcopal authority.‡ In later times many of the more religious communities, to escape the tyranny and rapacity of a secular bishop, placed themselves under the protection of the King, or some powerful lord, whose tyranny in a certain time became more grinding and exacting than that of the Bishop.¹

The extent of Charlemagne's Empire may be estimated by the list of his Metropolitan Sees: they were Rome, Ravenna, Milan, Friuli (Aquila), Grado, Cologne, Mentz, Saltzburg, Treves, Sens, Besançon, Lyons, Rouen, Rheims, Arles, Vienne, Moutiers in the Tarantaise, Ivredun, Bourdeaux, Tours, Bourges.‡ To these Metropolitans lay the appeal in the first instance from the arbitrary power of the Bishop. This power it was the policy of Charlemagne to elevate to the utmost.‡ The Capitularies enact the regular visitation of all the parishes within their diocese by the Bishops, even those within peculiar jurisdiction.‡ Their special mission, besides preaching and confirmation, and the suppression of heathen ceremonies, was to make inquisition into all incests,

† "Abbates et monachos omnimodis volumus et præcipimus, ut episcopis suis omni humilitate et hobbredientiâ sint subjecti, sicut canonica constitutione mandati."—Capit. Gen. A.D. 769; Hludovic. i.; Imp. Capit. Aquisgran. 825.

‡ "Statutum est a domino rege et sancto synodo, ut episcopi iustitias faciant in suas parrochias. Si non obediunt aliqua persona episcopo suo de abbatis, presbyteris . . . monachis et cæteris clericis, veniant ad metropolitanum suum, et ille dijudicet causam cum suffraganeis suis . . . Et si aliquid est quod episcopus metropolitanus non possit corrigere vel pacificare, tunc tandem veniant accusatores cum accusatu, cum literis metropolitani, ut sciamus veritatem rei."—Capitul. Frankfurt. 705.

¹ Lehuéron, p. 493.

‡ Baluzius, Formula 38.

‡ Eginhard, c. xxxiii. The omission of Narbonne and one or two others perplexes ecclesiastical antiquarians. To these 21 archbishoprics of his realm Charlemagne in his last will bequeathed a certain legacy, two-thirds of his personal property.

‡ Ellendorf (Du Karolinger) asserts that the capitularies nowhere recognise appeals to the Pope. The metropolitans and metropolitan synods were the courts of last resort, except, it should seem, the emperors'.

‡ "Similiter nostras in beneficio datas, quam et aliorum ubi reliquæ præesse videntur."—Capitular. A.D. 813.

parricides, fratricides, adulteries, heresies, and all other offences against God. The Bishop on this visitation was received at the expense of the clergy and the people (he was forbidden to oppress the people by exacting more than was warranted by custom).<sup>o</sup> The monasteries were subject to the same jurisdiction. The clergy made certain fixed payments, either in kind or money, as vassals to their superiors of the hierarchy;<sup>p</sup> the Bishops, notwithstanding the prohibition of the canons, persisted in demanding fees for the ordination of clerks: both these are, as it were, tokens of ecclesiastical vassalage, strikingly resembling the commuted services and the payments for investiture.

The clergy were under the absolute dominion of the Bishop; they could be deposed, expelled from communion, even punished by stripes. No priest could officiate in a diocese, or leave the diocese, without permission of the Bishop.<sup>q</sup>

The primitive form of the election of the Bishop remained, but only the form; the popular election had, in all higher offices, faded into a shadow; that of the clergy retained for a long time more substantive reality. It was this growing feudality of the Church, which, if it gave not to the sovereign the absolute right of nomination, invested him with a co-ordinate power, and made it his interest if not his royal duty to assert that power. The Metropolitan, the Bishop, the Abbot, had now a double character; he was a supreme functionary in the Church, a beneficiary in the realm. The Sovereign would not and could not abandon to popular or to ecclesiastical election the nomination to these important fiefs; Charlemagne held them in his own hands, and disposed of them according to his absolute will.

Charlemagne himself promoted usually men worthy of ecclesiastical dignity; but his successors, like the older Merovingian kings, were not superior to the ordinary

Election of  
bishops.

<sup>o</sup> Capitular. A.D. 769 and 813.

<sup>p</sup> "Ut unum modium frumenti, et unum modium ordeï, atque unum modium vini . . . episcopi a presbyteris accipiant, et frisingam (a lamb) sex valentem denarios. Et si hæc non acci-

piant, si volunt, pro his omnibus duos solidos in denariis."—Karol. ii. Syn. apud Tolosam, A.D. 844.

<sup>q</sup> Capitular. vi. 163. "Clerici, quos increpatio non emendaverit, verberibus coerceantur."—vii. 302.

motives of favour, force, passion, or interest; they were constantly environed by greedy and rapacious candidates for Church preferments; helmeted warriors on a sudden became mitred prelates, needy adventurers wealthy abbots. Still was the Church degraded, enslaved, disqualified for her own office, by her power and wealth. The successors of Boniface, and his missionary clergy on the shores of the Rhine, became gradually, as they grew rich and secure, like the Merovingian hierarchy who had offended the austere virtue of Boniface. The pious and death-defying men whom Charlemagne planted in his new bishoprics and abbeys in the heart of Germany, with the opulence assumed the splendour, princely pride, secular habits, of their rival nobles. Even his son witnessed and suffered by the rapid, inevitable, melancholy change.

The parochial clergy were still appointed by the election of the clergy of the district, with the assent of the people; the Bishop nominated only in case a fit <sup>Parochial clergy.</sup> person was not found by those with whom lay the ordinary election.\* Nor could he be removed unless legally convicted of some offence. Yet even in France there was probably not as yet a regular, and by no means an universal division of parishes; certainly not in the newly-conquered dominions. They were either chapels endowed, and appointed to by some wealthy prince or noble; the chaplain dwelt within the castle-walls, and officiated to the immediate retainers or surrounding vassals: or the churches were served from some cathedral or conventual establishment, where the clergy either lived together according to canonical rule, or were members of the conventual body. The Bishop alone had in general the title to the distribution of the tithes, one-third, usually, to himself and his clergy (of his clergy's necessities and his own he was the sole, not always impartial or liberal judge); one to the Fabric, the whole buildings of the See; one to the Poor. Each, however, in his narrower sphere, and according to his personal

\* "Et primum quidem ipsius loci presbyteri, vel cæteri clerici, idoneum sibi rectorem eligant; deinde populi qui ad eandem plebem aspiciunt, sequatur assensus. Si autem in ipsâ plebe talis

inveniri non poterit, qui illud opus competenter peragere possit, tunc episcopus de suis quem idoneum judicaverit, inibi constituat."—Hludowici, ii. Imp. Convent. Ticin. A.D. 855.

influence, the devotion or respect of his people, had his sources of wealth; the gifts and oblations, the fees, which were often prohibited but always prohibited in vain. The free gratuity became an usage, custom, custom right. Where spiritual life and death depended on priestly ministration, that which love and reverence might not be strong enough to lure forth would be wrung from fear; where the holy image might be veiled, the relic withdrawn from worship, the miracle unperformed, to say nothing of the actual ritual services, the priest might exact the oblation. Whether from the higher or lower, the purer or more sordid motive, neither the land nor the tithes of the Church were the measure of the popular tribute. While, on the other hand, the alms of the clergy themselves out of their own revenues, those bestowed at their instance by the wealthy, by the princely or the vulgar robber as an atonement or commutation for his sins, the bequests made on the death-bed of the most wicked as well as the most holy, re-distributed a vast amount of that fund of riches—if not wisely, at least without stint, without cessation.

Yet, no doubt, by the deference which Charlemagne paid to the clergy, by his own somewhat ostentatious religion, by his munificent grants and donations, above all by his elevation of their character through his wise legislation, however imperfect or unenduring the success of his laws, Charlemagne raised the hierarchical power far more than he depressed it by submitting it to his equal autocracy. There was no humiliation in being, with the rest of Western Christendom, subject to Charlemagne. Even if the Church did feel some temporary obscuration of her authority, some slight limitation of her independence, conscious of her own strength, she might be her own silent prophet of her future emancipation and more than emancipation.

The Council of Frankfort displays most fully the power assumed by Charlemagne over the hierarchy as well as the lay nobility of the realm, the mingled character, the all-embracing comprehensiveness of his legislation. The assembly at Frankfort was at once a Diet or Parliament of the Realm and an ecclesiastical

Council of  
Frankfort.

Council. It took cognizance alternately of matters purely ecclesiastical and of matters as clearly secular. Charlemagne was present and presided in the Council of Frankfort.\* The canons as well as the other statutes were issued chiefly in his name. The Council was attended by a great number of bishops from every part of the Western Empire, from Italy, Germany, Gaul, Aquitaine, some (of whom Alcuin was the most distinguished, though Alcuin was now chiefly resident at the court of Charlemagne) from Britain. Two bishops, named Theophylact and Stephen, appeared as legates from Pope Hadrian. The powerful Hadrian was still on the throne, in the last year of his pontificate, when Charlemagne summoned and presided over this Diet-Council. A.D. 794.

The first object of this Council was the suppression of a new heresy, and the condemnation of its authors, certain Spanish bishops. Nestorianism, which had been a purely Oriental heresy, now appeared in a new form in the West. Two Spanish prelates, Elipand, Archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, Bishop of Urgel (whether to conciliate their Mohammedan masters,<sup>1</sup> or trained to more than usual subtlety by communication with Arabian writers),<sup>2</sup> had framed a new scheme, according to which, while they firmly maintained the co-equality of the Son as to his divine nature, they asserted that, as to his humanity, Christ was but the adopted Son of the Father. Hence the name of the new sect, the Adoptians. It was singular that, while the Greeks exhausted the schools of rhetoric for distinctive terms applicable to the Godhead, the Western form of the heresy chose its phraseology from the Roman law. This strange theory had been embraced by a great number of proselytes.<sup>3</sup> Felix of Urgel, a subject of Charle-

\* "*Præcipiente et presidente piissimo et gloriosissimo domino nostro Carolo rege.*"—*Synod. ad Episc. Gall. et German. Labbe, 1032.* Charles himself writes: "*Congregationi sacerdotum auditor et arbiter adsedi.*"—*Car. Magn. Epist. ad Episc. Hisp.*

<sup>1</sup> Charlemagne expresses his sympathy with the oppression of Elipand under the Gentiles: "*Vestram quam patimini inter gentes lacrymabili gemitu condoleamus*

*oppressionem.*" But his language almost implies that he considers them as subjects of his Empire, as well as subjects of the Church. Urgel, near the Pyrenees, was in the dominions of Charlemagne.

<sup>2</sup> According to Alcuin, the scheme had originated in certain writers at Cordova.—*Alcuin, Epist. v. 11, 5.*

<sup>3</sup> S. Leidrad is said to have converted 20,000 bishops, priests, monks, laymen, men and women.—*Paullin. Epist. ad*

magne, had already been summoned before a synod at

Ratisbon, at which presided Charles himself.

A.D. 752.

Felix recanted his heresy, and swore never to teach it more. He was sent to Rome, imprisoned by order of Pope Hadrian, and condemned to sign and twice most solemnly to swear to his abandonment of his opinions. He resumed his bishopric, and returned to his errors; he was again prosecuted, and took refuge among the Saracens.

The doctrines of Elipand and Felix were condemned as wicked and impious with the utmost unanimity. Already Pope Hadrian, in a letter to the Bishops of Spain and Galicia, had condemned these opinions; but the Emperor, not content with communicating the unanimous decision of the Pope and the Bishops of Italy, of those of Gaul and Germany, with certain wise and holy doctors whom he had summoned from Britain, thinks it necessary to address the condemned bishops in his own name. He enters into the theology of the question; and it must be said that both the divinity and the mild and even affectionate tone of the royal letter are much superior to that of Pope Hadrian and of the Italian bishops.<sup>7</sup>

But the more important act of the Council of Frankfort was the rejection of the Second Council of Nicea, or, as it was inaccurately called, the Council of Constantinople. To this Council the East had given its assent. It had been sanctioned by Pope Hadrian, it spoke the opinions of successive pontiffs, it might be considered as the established law of Christendom. This law Charlemagne and his assembly of feudal prelates scrupled not to annul and abrogate. Image-worship in the East had gained the victory, and was endeared to the Byzantine Greeks as distinguishing them more decidedly from the iconoclastic

Episc. Arno. Edited by Mabillon. Compare Walch, p. 743. Leo III. Epist.; Alcuin, v. 11, 7; other authorities in Walch, ix. p. 752. Walch wrote a history of the Adoptionists.

<sup>7</sup> According to the letter of the Italian bishops, a letter arrived from Elipand of Toledo while Charlemagne was seated in his palace in the midst of his clergy.

It was read aloud. At its close the imperial theologian immediately rose from his throne, and from its steps addressed the meeting in a long speech, refuting all the doctrines of Elipand. When he had ended, he inquired, "What think ye of this?"—Epist. Episcop. Ital. apud Labbe, p. 1022.

Mohammedans (the Image-worshippers branded Iconoclasm as Mohammedanism). It had a strong hold on all the population of Southern Europe, as the land of the yet unextinguished arts, as the birthplace of the new polytheistic Christianity, but it was far less congenial to the Teutonic mind. The Franks were at war with the Saxon idolaters; and though there was no great similitude between the rude and shapeless deities of the Teutonic forests and the carved or painted saints and angels of the existing Christian worship, yet, though with the passion of most savage nations for ornament and splendour the Franks delighted in the brilliant decorations of their churches (Charlemagne laid Italy under contribution to adorn his palace); still their more profound spirituality of conception, their inclination to the vague, the mystic, the indefinite, or their unhabituated deadness to the influence of art, made them revolt from that ardent devotion to images which prevailed throughout the South. Such at least was the disposition of Charlemagne himself, and the author of the Carolinian Books.

Constantine Copronymus,\* the Iconoclast, had endeavoured to make an alliance with Pepin the Frank. Pepin held a council on image-worship at Gen-<sup>A.D. 787.</sup>tilly, at which the ambassadors of Copronymus appeared, it is not known for what ostensible purpose, perhaps to negotiate a matrimonial union between the courts, but no doubt with the view to detach Pepin from the support of the Italian rebels to the Eastern Empire. Of these the real head was the Pope, whose refusal of allegiance to the Emperor, and alliance with the Franks, were defended on the plea that the Emperor was an iconoclast and a heretic. Pepin probably took no great pains to understand the religious question; in that he was content to acquiesce in the judgment of the Pope; nor were the offers of Constantine sufficiently tempting to incline him to break up his Italian policy. Image-worship remained an undecided question with the Franks.

But Charlemagne and the Council of Frankfort proclaimed their deliberate judgment on a question already, it might seem, decided by a Council which aspired to be

thought Œcumenic, and by the notorious sanction of more than one Pope. The canon of the Council of Frankfort overstates the decrees of Nicea. It arraigns that synod as commanding, under the pain of anathema, the same service and adoration to be paid to the images as to the Divine Trinity. This adoration they reject with contempt, and condemn with one voice. But the brief decree of Frankfort must be considered in connexion with the deliberate and declared opinions of Charlemagne, as contained in the famous Carolinian Books. These books speak in the name of the Emperor; Charlemagne himself boldly descends into the arena of controversy. The real authorship of these books can never be known; it is difficult not to attribute them to Alcuin, the only known writer equal to the task. It is probable indeed that the Emperor may have called more than one counsellor to his assistance in this deliberate examination of an important question, but to Christendom the books spoke in the name and with the authority of the Emperor.

Throughout the discussion, Charlemagne treads his middle path with firmness and dignity. He rejects, with uncompromising disdain, all worship of images; he will not tamper, perhaps he feels or writes as if he felt the danger of tampering, in the less pliant Latin, with those subtle distinctions of meaning which the Western Church was obliged to borrow, and without clear understanding, from the finer and more copious Greek. He rejects alike adoration, worship, reverence, veneration.<sup>a</sup> He will not admit the kneeling before them; the burning of lights or the offering of incense;<sup>a</sup> or the kissing of a lifeless image, though it represent the Virgin and the Child. Images are not even to be revered, as the saints, as living men, as relics, as the Bible, as the Holy Sacrament, as the Cross, as the sacred vessels of the Church, as the Church itself.<sup>b</sup> But, on the other hand, Charlemagne is no Iconoclast: he admits images and pictures into churches as ornaments, and, according to the definition of Gregory the

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. 21, 23; iii. 18; ii. 27; ii. 30.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. ii. 21, 24; iii. 25; ii. 30, 27;  
<sup>a</sup> "Quod ante imagines luminaria i. 28, 29; iii. 27; iv. 3, 12. Walch, concinnentur, et thymiamata adoleantur."—iv. 3; iv. 23. vol. xi. pp. 57, 59.

Great, as keeping alive the memory of pious men and of pious deeds.\* The representatives of the Pope ventured no remonstrance either against the accuracy or the conclusion of the Council. The Carolinian Books were sent to the Pope at Rome. Hadrian still ruled: he was too prudent not to dissemble the indignation which he must have felt at this usurpation of spiritual authority by the temporal power, at least by this assertion of independence in a Transalpine Council, a Council chiefly of barbarian prelates; or to betray his wounded pride at this quiet contempt of his theological arguments, which could hardly be unknown as forming part of the proceedings in the Nicene Council, yet were not even noticed by the Imperial controversialist. There is no peremptory declaration of his own infallibility, no anathema against the contumacious prelates, no protest against the Imperial interference. A feeble answer, still extant, testifies at once the authenticity of the Carolinian Books, the embarrassment of the Pope within the grasp of a more powerful reasoner and more learned theologian, his awe of a superior power. Nor did this controversy lead to any breach of outward amity, or seem to deaden the inward feelings of mutual respect. Hadrian writes this, his last letter, with profound deference. Charlemagne shed tears at the death of the Pontiff; and, as has been said, showed the strongest respect for his memory.

A D. 795.  
Hadrian died  
Dec. 26. 796.

These theological questions settled before the Council of Frankfort, a singular spectacle was exhibited, as though to make an ostentatious display of the power and dubious clemency of Charlemagne. Tassilo, the Duke of Bavaria, cousin to the Emperor, who had been subdued, deposed, despoiled of his territory, was introduced, humbly to acknowledge his offences against the Frankish sovereign, to entreat his forgiveness, to throw himself and all his family on the mercy of Charlemagne. The Emperor condescended to be merciful, but he kept possession of the

\* See the very curious description of Charlemagne's own splendid palace at Ingelheim.—Ermondus Nigellus, iv. The whole Scripture history was painted

on the walls. There were sculptures representing all the great events in profane history. "*Regia namque domus late persculpta nitescit.*"

territory. The unfortunate Tassilo and all his family ended their days in a monastery. The Council added to its canons, condemnatory of the Spanish heresy and of image-worship, a third, ratifying this degradation, spoliation, and life-long imprisonment of the Duke of Bavaria.

Of the two following canons, one regulated the sale of corn, and fixed a price beyond which it was unlawful to sell it. The other related to the circulation of the coin, and enacted that whoever should refuse the royal money, when of real silver and of full weight, if a free man, should pay a fine of fifteen shillings to the Crown; if a slave, forfeit what he offered for sale, and be publicly flogged on his naked person.

The ninth canon decreed that Peter, a Bishop, should appear, with the two or three bishops who had assisted at his consecration, or at least his Archbishop, as his compurgators, and should swear before God and the angels that he had not taken counsel concerning the death of the King, or against his kingdom, or been guilty of any act of disloyalty.<sup>d</sup> But as the Bishop could not bring his compurgators into court, he proposed that *his man* should undergo the ordeal, the judgment of God; that himself should swear, without touching either the holy relics or the Gospel, to his own innocence; and that God would deal with *his man* according to the truth or falsehood of his oath. What the ordeal was does not appear, but *the man* passed through it unhurt; and the Bishop, by the clemency of the King, was restored to his honours.

Other canons, of a more strictly ecclesiastical character, were passed:—i. To enforce discipline in monasteries. ii. On the residence of the clergy. iii. On Ordinations, which were fixed for presbyters to the age of thirty. Virgins were not to take the vows before twenty-two. No one was to receive the slave of another; no bishop to ordain a slave without permission of his master. iv. The payment of tithe. v. For the maintenance of churches by those

<sup>d</sup> This conspiracy is alluded to in Eginhard, sub ann. 792. See the note of Sirmund in Labbe, p. 1066.

<sup>e</sup> No abbot was to blind or mutilate

one of his monks for any crime whatever. "Nisi regulari disciplinæ subjaceant."

who held the benefices.<sup>f</sup> VI. Against the worship of new saints without authority. VII. For the destruction of trees and groves sacred to pagan deities. VIII. Against the belief that God can be adored only in three languages; "there is no tongue in which prayer may not be offered." The Teutonic spirit is here again manifesting itself. The last statute of the Council, at the suggestion of the Emperor, admitted the Briton Alcuin, on account of his ecclesiastical erudition, to all the honours, and to be named in the prayers of the Council.<sup>g</sup>

Such was the Council of Frankfort, the first example of that Teutonic independence in which the clergy appear as feudal beneficiaries around the throne of their temporal liege lord, with but remote acknowledgment of their spiritual sovereign, passing acts not merely without his direct assent, but in contravention of his declared opinions. Charlemagne, not yet Emperor, is manifestly lord over the whole mind of the West. Except that he condescends to take counsel with the prelates instead of the military nobles, he asserts the same unlimited authority over ecclesiastical and civil affairs. He is too powerful for the Pope not to be his humble and loyal subject. The Pope might take refuge in the thought that the assembly at Frankfort was but a local synod, and aspired not to the dignity of an Œcumenic Council; and to local or national synods much power had always been allowed to regulate the discipline of their Churches, provided they issued no canons which infringed on the Catholic doctrines: yet these were statutes for the whole realm of Charlemagne, almost commensurate with the Western Patriarchate the actual spiritual dominion of the Roman Pontiff, with Latin Christendom. Yet, on the other hand, the hierarchy of the Church is advancing far beyond the ancient boundaries of its power; it is imperceptibly, almost unconsciously, trenching on temporal ground. The Frankfort assembly is a diet as well as a synod. The prelates appear as the King's counsellors, not only in religious matters, or on

<sup>f</sup> If any one was found "by true men" he was compelled to restore them.—  
to have purloined timber, stone, or tiles, xxvi.  
from the churches, for his own house, <sup>g</sup> Canon lii.

matters on the doubtful borders between religion and policy, but likewise on the affairs of the Empire—affairs belonging to the internal government of the State.

And though Charlemagne, as liege lord of the Teutonic race, as conqueror of kingdoms beyond the Teutonic borders, as sovereign of almost the whole transalpine West, and afterwards as Emperor, stood so absolutely alone above all other powers; though the Pope must be content to lurk among his vassals; yet doubtless, by his confederacy with the Pope, Charlemagne fixed, even on more solid foundations, the papal power. The Pope as well as the hierarchy was manifestly aggrandised by his policy. The Frankish alliance, the dissolution of the degrading connexion with the East, the magnificent donation, the acceptance of the Imperial crown from the Pope's hand, the visits to Rome, whether to protect the Pope from his unruly subjects or for devotion; everything tended to throw a deepening mysterious majesty around the Pope, the more imposing according to the greater distance from which it was contemplated, the more sublime from its indefinite and boundless pretensions. The Papacy had yet indeed to encounter many fierce contentions from without, and still more dangerous foes around, before it soared to the plenitude of its power and influence in the period from Gregory VII. to Innocent III. It was to sink to its lowest point of degradation in the tenth century, before it emerged again to contest the dominion of the world with the Empire, with the successors of Charlemagne, to commit the spiritual and temporal powers in a long and obstinate strife, in which for a time it was to gain the victory.

The brief epoch of nascent letters, arts, education, during the reign of Charlemagne, was as premature, as insulated, as transitory, as the unity of his Empire. Alcuin, whom one great writer<sup>b</sup> calls the intellectual prime minister of Charlemagne, with all his fame, his well-merited fame, and those whom another great writer<sup>c</sup> calls the Paladins of his literary court, Clement, Angilbert,<sup>k</sup> all but Eginhard, were no more than the con-

Arts and letters under Charlemagne.

<sup>b</sup> M. Guizot.

<sup>c</sup> Mr. Hallam.

<sup>k</sup> Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, of a much higher cast of mind, was bred under Charlemagne.

servators and propagators of the old traditional learning, the Augustinian theology, the Boethian science, the grammar, the dry logic and meagre rhetoric, the Church music, the astronomy, mostly confined to the calculation of Easter, of the trivium and quadrivium. The Life of Charlemagne by Eginhard is unquestionably the best historic work which had appeared in the Latin language for centuries; but Eginhard, during his later years, in his monastery in the Odenwald, stooped to be a writer of legend.<sup>m</sup> Perhaps the Carolinian books are the most remarkable writings of the time. It might seem as if Latin literature, as it had almost expired in its originality among the great lawyers, so it revived in jurisprudence. Even the schools which Charlemagne established, if he did not absolutely found, on a wide and general scale,<sup>n</sup> had hardly a famous teacher, and must await some time before they could have their Erigena, still later their Anselm, their Abelard, with his antagonists and followers. What that Teutonic poetry was which Charlemagne cherished with German reverence, it is vain to inquire: whether tribal Frankish songs, or the groundwork of those national poems which, having passed through the Latin verse of the monks,<sup>o</sup> came forth at length as the Nibelungen and the Heldenbuch.

<sup>m</sup> The History of the Translation of the relics of S. Marcellinus and S. Peter Martyr,\* and their miracles, is one of the most extraordinary works of this extraordinary age, written, as it was, by a statesman and counsellor of two emperors. Two clerks, servants of Abbot Eginhard and the abbot of St. Médard in Soissons, are sent to Rome to steal relics. They make a burglarious entry by night into a tomb (such sacrilege was a capital crime), carry off the two saints, with difficulty convey the

holy plunder out of Rome and through Italy (some of the party pilfering a limb or two on the way). Eginhard is not merely the shameless receiver of these stolen treasures; there is no bound to his pious and public exultation. The saints are fully consentient, rejoice in their subduction from their inglorious repose; their restless activity reveals itself in perpetual visions, till they are settled to their mind in their chosen shrines. A hundred and fifty pages of miracles follow; wrought in all quarters, even in the imperial palace. It might almost seem surprising that there should be a blind, lame, paralytic, or dæmoniac person left in the land.

\* An exorcist martyred at Rome. The martyrdom is related in a curious trochaic poem, not without spirit and vigour, ascribed also to Eginhard.—Eginhardi Opera, by M. Teulet. Soc. Hist. de France.

<sup>n</sup> See the schools in Hallam, ii. p. 478.

<sup>o</sup> See the poem De Expeditione Attilæ.

## CHAPTER II.

## LOUIS THE PIOUS.

THE unity of the Empire, so favourable to the unity of Christendom, ceased not at the death of Charle-  
Jan. 28, A.D. 814. magne, not until after some years of the reign of his successor. But the unity of the Church, as it depended not on the personal character of the sovereign, remained undis severed. In the contests among Charlemagne's descendants the Pope mingles with his full unbroken authority; while the strife among the military feudatories of the Empire only weakens, or exposes the weakness, of the imperial power. The influence of the great Transalpine prelates, so often on different sides in the strife, aggrandises that of the Pope, whom each party was eager, at any sacrifice, to obtain as an ally. Already the Papal Legates, before the pontificate of Nicolas I., begin to appear, and to conduct themselves with arrogance, which implies conscious power. The awful menace of excommunication is employed to restrain sovereign princes. The Emperor for a time still holds his supremacy. Rome is, in a certain sense, an imperial city: the Pope is not considered duly elected without the Emperor's approbation; the successor of Leo III. throws the blame of his hasty consecration on the clergy and people. But first the separation of the Italian kingdom from the Empire, and afterwards the feebleness, or the distance, or the pre-occupation of the Emperor, allows this usage to fall into desuetude.

Yet, during the whole of this period, and indeed much later, in the highest days of the Papacy, the limited and contested power of the Pope in Rome strongly contrasts with his boundless pretensions and vast authority in remoter regions. The Pope and the Bishop of Rome might appear distinct persons. Already that turbulence of the Roman people, which afterwards, either in obedience to,

or in fierce strife with, the lawless petty sovereigns of Romagna, degraded the Papacy to its lowest state, had broken out, and was constantly breaking out, unless repressed by some strong friendly arm, or overawed by a pontiff of extraordinary vigour or sanctity. The life of the Pope, in these tumults, was not secure. While mighty monarchs in the remotest parts of Europe were trembling at his word, he was himself at the mercy of a lawless rabble. The Romans still aspired to maintain their nationality. It was rare at that time for any one but a born Roman to attain the Papacy ;\* and no doubt at each promotion there would be bitter disappointment among rival prelates and conflicting interests. It was at once the strength and weakness of the Pope ; it arrayed sometimes a powerful party on his side, or condensed a powerful host against him. Though the Romans had been overawed by the magnificence and grandeur of Charlemagne, and had joined, it might seem, cordially in their acclamations at his assumption of the Empire, which still implied dominion over Rome, yet the Franks, the Transalpines, were foreigners, were barbarians. The Pope was constantly compelled by Roman turbulence to recur to his imperial protector (among whose titles and offices was Defender of the Church of Rome) ; yet the presence of the Emperor, while it flattered, wounded the pride of the Romans : if it gratified one faction, embittered the hatred of the others.

Leo III. must have been among the most munificent and splendid of the Roman Pontiffs. Charlemagne had made sumptuous and imperial offerings on the altar of St. Peter. His donation seems to have endowed the Pope with enormous wealth. Long pages in Leo's Life are filled with his gifts to every church in Rome—to many in the Papal territories. Buildings were lined with marble and mosaic : there were images of gold and silver of great weight and costly workmanship (a silent but significant protest against the Council of Frankfort), priestly robes of

\* Of nearly fifty Popes, from Hadrian to Gregory V. (a German created by Otho the Great), there appears one Tuscan (Martin or Marinus), and three

or four of doubtful origin : every one of the rest is described as "*patriâ Romanus*."

silk and embroidery, and set with precious stones; censers and vessels of gold, columns of silver. The magnificence of the Roman churches must have rivalled or surpassed the most splendid days of the later republic, and the most ostentatious of the Cæsars.<sup>b</sup>

Leo, like other prodigal sovereigns, may have exacted the large revenues, which he spent with such profusion, with hardness, which might be branded as avarice; and hence the Pope, who was thus gorgeously adorning the city and all his dominions with noble buildings, and decorating the churches with unexampled splendour, was still in perpetual danger from popular insurrection. Even during the reign of Charlemagne, Leo was hardly safe in Rome. Immediately on the death of the Emperor, the embers of the old hostility broke out again into a flame; and the Pope held his throne only through the awe of the imperial power, at the will of his successor, Louis the Pious.

There was a manifest conflict, during his later years, in the court, in the councils, in the mind of Charlemagne, between the King of the Franks and the Emperor of the West; between the dissociating, independent Teutonic principle, and the Roman principle of one code, one dominion, one sovereign. The Church, though Teutonic in descent, was Roman in the sentiment of unity. The great churchmen were mostly against the division of the Empire. The Empire was still one and supreme; the vigorous impulse given to the monarchical authority by its founder maintained for a few years the majesty of his son's throne. That unity had been threatened by the proclaimed division of the realm between the sons of Charlemagne. The old Teutonic usage of equal distribution seemed doomed to prevail over the august unity of the Roman Empire. What may appear more extraordinary, the kingdom of Italy was the inferior appanage: it carried not with it the Empire, which was still to retain a certain supremacy;

<sup>b</sup> Anastasius in Vit. Leo expended 1320 pounds of gold (pounds weight?) and 24,000 of silver on the churches in Rome. Thirty-five pages of this faithful chronicler of the wealth and expenditure

of the Roman See are devoted to the details.—Compare Ellendorf, *Die Karolinger und die Hierarchie ihrer Zeit.* ii. p. 65.

that was reserved for the Teutonic sovereign. It might seem as if this were but the continuation of the Lombard kingdom, which Charlemagne still held by the right of conquest. It was bestowed on Pepin; after his death intrusted to Bernhard, Pepin's illegitimate but only son. Wiser counsels prevailed. The two elder sons of Charlemagne died without issue; Louis the third son was summoned from his kingdom of Aquitaine, and solemnly crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, as successor to the whole Empire. April, 813.

Louis,<sup>c</sup>—his name of Pious bespeaks the man—thus the heir of Charlemagne, had inherited the religion of his father; but in his gentler and less resolute character that religion wrought with an abasing and enfeebling rather than ennobling influence. As King of Aquitaine Louis had been distinguished for some valour, activity, and conduct in war against the Saracens of Spain;<sup>d</sup> but far more for his munificence to the churches and convents of his kingdom. The more rigid clergy had looked forward with eager hope to the sole dominion of the pious king; the statesmen among them had concurred in the preservation of the line of the Empire; yet Louis would himself have chosen as his example his ancestor Carloman, who retired from the world into the monastery of San Casino, rather than that of his father, the lord and conqueror of so many realms. It required the authority of Charlemagne, not unsupported even by the most austere of the clergy, the admirers of his piety, to prevent him from turning monk.<sup>e</sup>

Yet, on his accession, the religion of Louis might seem to display itself in its strength rather than in its weakness. The licence of his father's court shrank away from the sight of the holy sovereign. The concubines of the late Em-

<sup>c</sup> Ermoldus gives the German derivation of the name Louis (Hludwig): "*Nempe sonat Hluto præclarum, Wigeh quoque Mars est.*"—*Apud Pertz, ii. p. 468.*

<sup>d</sup> The panegyrist of Louis, the poet Ermonodus Nigellus, asserts his vigorous administration of Aquitaine. He describes at full length the siege of Barcelona, giving probably a much larger share of glory than his due to Louis. For his general character see Thegan. c. xix. Louis understood Greek; spoke

Latin as his vernacular tongue. On the youth of Louis see the excellent work of Funck, "*Ludwig der Fromme.*" Sir F. Palgrave highly colours the character and accomplishments of Louis. Louis the Pious renounced the Pagan (Teutonic?) poetry which he was accustomed to repeat in his youth.—*Thegan, p. 19.*

<sup>e</sup> Louis was a serious man. When at the banquet the jonglers and mimes made the whole board burst out into laughter, Louis was never seen to smile.

peror, even his daughters and their paramours, disappeared from the sacred precincts of the palace. Louis stood forward the reformer, not the slave of the clergy: to outward appearance, like Charlemagne, he was the Pope, or rather the Caliph of his realm. He condescended to sit in council with his bishops, but he was the ostensible head of the council; his commissioners were still bearers of unresisted commands to ecclesiastical as to temporal princes. Yet the discerning eye might detect the coming change: the ascendancy is passing from the Emperor to the bishops. It is singular, too, that the nobles almost disappear; in each transaction, temporal as well as ecclesiastical, the bishops advance into more distinct prominence, the nobles recede into obscurity. The great ecclesiastics, too, are now almost all of Teutonic race: the effete and dissolute Roman hierarchy has died away; German ambition seizes the high places in the Church; German force animates their counsels. The great prelates, Ebbo of Rheims, Agobard of Lyons, Theodolf of Orleans, are manifestly of Teutonic descent. Benedict of Aniane is the assumed name of Witiza, son of the Gothic Count of Magelone; Benedict, the most rigorous of ascetics, who stooped to the name, but thought the rule of the elder Benedict of Nursia far below monastic perfection. The bastard sons of Charles Martel appear, two of them even now, not as kings or nobles, but as abbots or monks; compelled, perhaps, to shroud themselves from the jealousy of the legitimate race by this disqualification for temporal rule, only to exercise a more powerful influence through their sacred character.<sup>1</sup> Adalard, Wala, Bernarius, were the sons of Bernhard, an illegitimate son of Charles Martel. Adalard, Abbot of Corvey, and Bernarius, were already monks: the Count Wala was among the most honoured counsellors of Charlemagne. The nomination of Louis to the sole empire had not been unopposed. Count Wala, some of the higher prelates, Theodolf of Orleans, no doubt Wala's own brothers Adalard and Bernarius, would have preferred, and were known or

<sup>1</sup> Funck, p. 42. He observes further: konnten natürlich den Bibelleser und "Die lustigen Gesellen an Karls Hof, Psalmsinger nicht an die Stelle Karls die Buhlsener Töchter, denen Ludwig wünschen." Politics make strange mit seiner Heiligkeit, lächerlich war, coalitions!

suspected to have pressed upon the Emperor the young Bernhard, the son, whom Charlemagne had legitimated, or might have legitimated, of the elder Pepin, rather than the monk-King of Aquitaine. Wala indeed had hastened, after the death of Charlemagne, to pay his earliest homage at Orleans to Louis. He thought it more safe, however, to shave his imperilled head, and become a monk. The whole family was proscribed: Adalard was banished to the island of Normoutiers; Bernarius to Lerins; Theodrada and Gundrada the sisters, Gundrada, who alone had preserved her chastity in the licentious court of Charlemagne, were ignominiously dismissed from the court.<sup>5</sup> Aug. 1.

A diet at Aix-la-Chapelle was among the earliest acts of Louis the Pious. From this council commissioners were despatched throughout the empire to receive complaints and to redress all acts of oppression.<sup>b</sup> Multitudes were found who had been unrighteously despoiled of their property or liberty by the counts or other powerful nobles. The higher clergy were not exempted from this inquest, nor the monasteries. In how many stern and vindictive hearts did this inquest sow the baleful seed of dissatisfaction!

The Emperor is not only the supreme justiciary in his Gallic and German realm; it is his unquestioned right, it is his duty, to decide between the Pope and his rebellious subjects—on the claims of Popes to their throne. Leo III. had apparently bestowed the imperial crown on Charlemagne, had recreated the Western Empire; but he had been obliged to submit to the judicial award of Charlemagne. He is again a suppliant for aid against the Romans to Louis and must submit to his haughty justice. Whether, as suggested, the prodigality of Leo had led to intolerable exactions—whether he had tyrannically exercised his power, or the turbulent Romans would bear no control—(these animosities must have had a deeper

<sup>5</sup> “*Quæ inter veneræ palatii ardore et juvenem venustates, etiam inter deliciarum mulcentia, et inter omnis libidinis blandimenta, sola meruit (ut credimus) reportare pudicitie palmam.*”—Vit. Adalh. apud Pertz, ii. p. 427.

Theodrada had been married; as a widow, could only claim the secondary praise of unblemished virtue.

<sup>b</sup> See the Constitutio, Bouquet vi. p. 410.

root than the disappointed ambition of Pope Hadrian's nephews)—a conspiracy was formed to depose Pope Leo, and to put him to death. Leo attempted to suppress the tumults with unwonted rigour: he seized and publicly executed the heads of the adverse faction.<sup>1</sup> The city burst out in rebellion: Rome became a scene of plunder, carnage, and conflagration. Intelligence was rapidly conveyed to the court of Louis. King Bernhard, who had been among the first to render his allegiance to his uncle at Aix-la-Chapelle, had been confirmed in the government of Italy. He was commanded to interpose, as the delegate of the Emperor. Bernhard fell ill at Rome, but sent a report by the imperial officer, the Count Gerhard, to the sovereign. With him went an humble mission from the Pope, to deprecate the displeasure of that sovereign, expressed at the haste and cruelty of his executions, and to answer the charge against him by the adverse faction. No sooner had King Bernhard withdrawn from Rome than, on the illness of Leo, a new insurrection broke out. The Romans sallied forth, plundered and burned the farms on the Pope's estates in the neighbourhood. They were only compelled to peace by the armed interference of the Duke of Spoleto.

The death of Leo, and, it should seem, the unpopular election of his successor, Stephen IV., exasperated rather than allayed the tumults. Stephen's first acts were to make the Romans swear fealty to the Emperor Louis;<sup>2</sup> to despatch a mission, excusing, on account of the popular tumults, his consecration without the approbation of the Emperor, or the presence of his legates.<sup>3</sup> In the third month of his pontificate Stephen was compelled to take refuge, or seek protection, at the feet of the Emperor, against his intractable subjects.<sup>4</sup> He was

June 12, 816.

June 22.

<sup>1</sup> A.D. 815, Eginhard, sub ann.

<sup>2</sup> Thegan., Vit. Hludovici, ii. 594.

<sup>3</sup> "Missis interim duobus legatis, qui quasi pro sua consecratione imperatori suggererent."—Eginhard, ann. 816.

<sup>4</sup> The poet disguises the flight of Stephen; he comes to Rheims at the invitation of Louis:—

"Tum jubet acciri Romana ab sede patronum."

The interview is described in his most

florid style. He makes the Pope draw a comparison between his visit and that of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon:—

"Rex tamen ante sagax flexat poplite adorat  
Terque quaterque, Dei sive in honore Petri.  
Suscipit hunc supplex Stephanus, manibusque  
sacrat

Sublevat e terra, basiat ora libens,  
Nunc oculos, nunc ora, caput, nunc pectora,  
colla,

Basiat alterutri Rexque sacerque plus."

ii. 221.

received in Rheims with splendid courtesy, and with his own hand crowned the emperor. Thus the fugitive from his own city aspires to ratify the will of Charlemagne, the choice of the whole empire, the hereditary right of Louis to the throne of the Western world. In Rome the awe of Louis commanded at least some temporary cessation of the conflict, and a general amnesty. Stephen returned to Rome, accompanied by those who had been the most daring and obstinate rebels against his predecessor Leo and the Church.<sup>o</sup> Stephen died soon after his return to Rome.

On his death Paschal I. was chosen by the impatient clergy and people, and compelled to assume the Pontificate without the Imperial sanction. But Jan. 24, 817.  
Pope Paschal I. Paschal was too prudent to make common cause with the Romans in this premature assertion of their independence; he sent a deprecatory embassy across the Alps, throwing the blame on the disloyal precipitancy of the people. The Romans received a grave admonition not again to offend against the majesty of the Empire.

Louis the Pious held his plenary Court a second time at Aix-la-Chapelle. The four great acts of this Council were among the boldest and most comprehensive ever submitted to a great national assembly. Diet at Aix-la-Chapelle.  
July, A.D. 817. The Emperor was still in theory the sole legislator; not only were the secret suggestions, but the initiatory motions in the Council, from the supreme power. It might seem, that in the three acts which regarded the hierarchy, the Emperor legislated for the Church; but it was in truth the Church legislating for herself through the Emperor. It was Teutonised Latin Christianity organising the whole trans-Alpine Church with no regard to the Western Pontiff. The vast reforms comprehended at once the whole clergy and the monasteries. It was the completion, ratification, extension of Charlemagne's scheme, a scheme by its want

All accounts agree in the festivities.  
The poet says—

"*Pocula densa volant, tangitque volentia Bacchus  
Corda.*"—ii. 227.

The pious king was not averse to wine.  
Funck erroneously ascribes Stephen's journey in the first instance to the

Pope's desire of crowning the Emperor.

• "Qui illic captivitate tenebantur,  
propter scelera et iniquitates suas, quas  
in sanctam Ecclesiam Romanam et erga  
dominum Leonem Papam gesserant."—  
Anastas, in Vit.

of success or universality still waiting its consummation.

<sup>Church laws.</sup> Chrodogang, Bishop of Metz, another Teuton, had, under the Merovingians, aspired to bring the clergy to live together under the canonical discipline. Charlemagne had given the sanction of his authority to this plan. Now the Archbishops and Bishops are invested in autocratic power to extend, if not absolutely to enforce this rigorous mode of life on all the Priesthood.<sup>p</sup> The sumptuary laws were universal, minute; the prohibition to bear arms; the proscription of their worldly pomp, of their belts studded with gold and precious stones; their brilliant and fine apparel; their gilded spurs. But if stripped of their pomp, it is only to increase immeasurably their power. If the sacerdotal army is to be arrayed under more rigid order, under more absolute command, it is only that it may be more efficient. Church property is strictly inviolable. II. The monasteries (which it might have seemed the sole object of Lewis, since his accession, to endow with ampler wealth)<sup>q</sup> are submitted to the iron rule of Benedict of Aniane. III. This hierarchy, so reformed, so reinvigorated, aspires to sever itself entirely from the state. A special Capitular asserted their full and independent rights. The election of Bishops was to be in the clergy and the commonalty; that of the abbots in the brotherhood of monks. The Crown, the nobles, surrendered or were excluded from all interposition. The right of patronage, even in nobles who built churches on their own domain, was limited to the nomination; once instituted, only the Bishop could depose or expel them. The whole property of the Church was under their indefeasible, irresponsible administration. The Teutonic aristocracy of the Church maintained its lofty tone. No unfree man could be admitted to holy orders; if he stole into orders,

<sup>p</sup> Wala, the exiled counsellor of Charlemagne, hereafter to succeed to the influence of Benedict of Aniane, held the same ecclesiastical notions as to the rigorous subordination of monks and clergy to rule. He denounces even the court chaplains: "*Quorum itaque vita neque sub regulâ est monachorum, neque sub episcopo militat canonicè,*

*præsertim cum nulla alia tirocinia sint ecclesiarum, quam sub his duobus ordinibus,*" *et seqq.*—Vita Walæ, Pertz, ii. 560.

<sup>q</sup> In the Regesta, during the first years of Louis, it is difficult to find out the public acts, among the long succession of grants to churches and monasteries. —Boehmer, Regesta, Frankfort, 1833.

might be degraded and restored to his lord. If the Bishop would ordain a slave, he must be first emancipated before the whole Church and the people. Yet were there provisions to limit abuses as well as to increase power. The three-fold division of the Church revenues is enacted, two-thirds to the poor, one to the monks and clergy. The clergy are prohibited from receiving donations or bequests to the wrong of near relations. None were to be received into monasteries in order to obtain their property. Church treasures might on one account only be pawned—the redemption of captives. Youths of either sex were not to be persuaded to receive the tonsure or take the veil without consent of their parents. All these laws are enacted by the Emperor in council for the whole empire, almost tantamount to Latin Christendom; of approbation, ratification, confirmation by the Pope, not one word!

The Council Diet of Aix-la-Chapelle, having thus legislated for the Church, contemplated the dangers of the State. The accidental fall of a gallery had Succession to the empire. endangered the life of the Emperor; he was seriously hurt; what, the wiser men bethought them, or had long before thought, were the Emperor thus suddenly cut off, had been the fate of the Empire? They clearly foresaw the danger of the old Teutonic principle, which had been threatened even under Charlemagne—equal division among the three sons of Louis. The mother of these three sons, as well as their closer adherents, might look with profound solicitude at the rivalry of Bernhard, son of Pepin, whom some of the most powerful had in their hearts, probably in their counsels, designated as the successor of Charlemagne. The Council must not separate without regulating the succession of the Empire. His counsellors urged this upon Louis. “I love my sons with equal affection; but I must not sacrifice the unity of the Empire to my love.” He laid this question before the Council,—“Is it right to delay a measure on which depends the welfare of the state?” “That,” was the universal acclamation, “which is necessary or profitable brooks no delay.” But such determination must be made with due solemnity. A fast of three days, prayer for divine grace, is ordered by the

pious Emperor. After these three days the decree was promulgated. It proclaimed the great principle of primogeniture. The whole empire fell in its undivided sovereignty, at the death of Louis, to his eldest son, Lothair. Two royal appanages were assigned, with the title of King, to Pepin II., Aquitaine, the Basque Provinces, the March of Tholouse, four Countships in Septimania and Burgundy: to Louis, the third son, Bavaria, Bohemia, Carinthia, the Slavian and Avarian provinces subject to the Franks. But the younger sons are every year to pay homage and offer gifts to the Emperor. Without his consent they could not make war or peace, send envoys to foreign lands, or contract marriage. If either died without heirs, his appanage fell back to the Empire. If he should leave more sons than one, the people were to choose one for their king, the Emperor to confirm the election. If one of the younger brothers should take arms against the Emperor, he was to be admonished; if contumacious, deposed.

This decree was fatal to Bernhard, the son, by a concubine, of Pepin,<sup>r</sup> who still held, by the unrevoked grant of Charlemagne, the kingdom of Italy. He alone was not summoned, had no place, in the great council of Aix-la-Chapelle. In the decree there was a total, inauspicious, significant silence as to his name. And this was the return for the early and ready allegiance which he had sworn to Louis, his fidelity in the affairs of Rome. Bernhard had nothing left but the energy of despair. Italy, weary and indignant, seemed ready to cast off the trans-Alpine yoke. The Lombards may have aspired to restore their ruined kingdom. Two great Bishops, Anselm of Milan, Wulfhold of Cremona, and many of the nobles, tendered him their allegiance, as their independent sovereign. The cities and people as far as the Po were ready or were compelled to take the oath of fealty. Pope Paschal was believed at least not unfriendly to the ambitious views of Bernhard. He was not without powerful partisans beyond the Alps. Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, was still faithful

<sup>r</sup> Funck observes that illegitimate is an unknown word; the term is usually *ex ancilla*.

to his cause. Wala and his brothers were at least suspected of the same treasonable inclinations; the three were placed, each in his convent, under more rigid care.

But Louis raised an overpowering force; the Lombards were not united. The Count of Brescia, the Bishop Rathald of Verona, retired across the Alps to the Emperor. The powerful dukes of Friuli and Spoleto adhered to the Imperial cause. Bernhard had nothing left but submission. He passed the Alps, and threw himself at his uncle's feet at Châlons on the Saone.\* The mild Louis interposed to mitigate the capital sentence pronounced against the rebel and the leaders of his party at Aix-la-Chapelle. His sterner counsellors, it is said the implacable Hermingard, insisted that Bernhard should be incapacitated for future acts of ambition by the loss of his eyes. The punishment was so cruelly or unskilfully executed, that he died of exhaustion or a broken heart. Some of the rebellious leaders suffered the same penalty: one died like Bernhard. The traitor Bishops, Orleans, Milan, Cremona, were shut up in monasteries. Now, too, were the three natural sons of Charlemagne, Drogo, Hugh, and Thierry, compelled to submit to the tonsure. Louis had sworn to be their guardian; the pious Emperor forced them to perpetual holy imprisonment.

Lothair, the elder son of Louis, now crowned, by the sole authority of Louis, King of Italy, assumed the dominion of the Peninsula; but the turbulent state of the whole country compelled him to return to Germany, and to demand succour in men and arms from his father. Rome was not behind the rest, as will speedily appear, in acts of violence and insubordination.

So far the son of Charlemagne had reigned in splendour, in justice, in firmness, in wisdom. He had been the legislator of the Empire, both as to its religious and temporal affairs. He had, it might seem, secured the succession in his house; he had suppressed all

\* Funck asserts that the Empress Hermingard decoyed him over the Alps, with promise of full pardon. I do not think that his authorities bear him out. —P. 65, and note.

rebellion with a strong hand, had only yielded to mercilessness, which could not injure him in the estimation of his Teutonic subjects. On the death of his wife Hermingard his mind was shaken, if not partially disturbed; his old religious feelings came back in all their rigour; it was feared that the pious Emperor would abdicate the throne, and retire into a monastery. His counsellors, to bind him to the world, persuaded him to take a second wife. His choice was made with a singular union of the indifference of a monk and the arbitrary caprice of an Eastern sultan.<sup>1</sup> The fairest daughters of the nobles were assembled Marriage of Louis. Feb. 819. for his inspection.<sup>2</sup> The monarch was at once captivated by the surpassing beauty of Judith, daughter of the Bavarian Count Wippo.<sup>3</sup> Judith was not only the most beautiful, according to the flattering testimony of bishops and abbots, she was the most highly-educated woman of the time. She played on the organ; she danced with perfect grace; she was eloquent as well as learned. The uxorious monarch yielded himself up to his blind passion.

From this time a strange feebleness comes over the character of Louis. The third year after his Diet of Attigny. Aug. 822. marriage the great diet of the Empire is summoned to Attigny-on-the-Aisne, not to take counsel for the defence, extension, or consolidation of the Empire; not to pass ecclesiastical or civil laws, but to witness the humiliating public penance of the Emperor. His sensitive conscience had long been preying upon him; it reproached him with the barbarous blinding and death of his nephew Bernhard; the chastisement of the insurgent Bishops; the presumptuous restraint which he had imposed on the holy monks Adalard, Wala, Bernarius; the enforced tonsure of his father's three sons.

Even in his own time, this act of Louis was compared by admiring Churchmen with the memorable penance

<sup>1</sup> "Timebatur a multis, ne regium vellet relinquere gubernaculum. Tandemque eorum voluntati satisfaciens, et undique adductas procerum filias inspicens, Judith, filiam Wippouis."—Astronomus, c. 32.

<sup>2</sup> "Inspectis plerisque nobilium filiabus."—Eginhard, p. 332.

<sup>3</sup> "The marriage was but four months after the death of Hermingard."—Ago-bard, Oper. ii. p. 65.

of Theodosius the Great. How great the difference between the crimes and character of the men! Theodosius, in a transport of passion, had ordered the promiscuous massacre of all the inhabitants of a flourishing city. Bernhard and his partisans had forfeited their lives according to the laws of the Franks: the Emperor had interposed, though vainly and weakly, only to mitigate the penalty. His offence against Adalhard and Wala was banishment from the court, confinement to monasteries of men who had aimed at excluding him from the Empire, whose abilities and influence he might still dread.<sup>7</sup> And for these delinquencies the trembling son of Charlemagne, the lord of his Empire, stood weeping and imploring the intercession of the clergy, and endeavoured to appease the wrath of Heaven by prodigal alms-giving and the most abject acts of penitence.<sup>8</sup> He supplicated the forgiveness of Adalhard and Wala, whom he had already recalled to his court, Wala, now that Benedict of Aniane was dead, speedily to assume absolute power over the mind of Louis.<sup>9</sup> Against them it would be difficult to show how he had grievously sinned. He deplored his having compelled the sons of Charlemagne to the tonsure. If we respect the conscientious scruples which induced Louis publicly to own his offences, to seek reconciliation with his enemies, some compassion and more contempt mingle with that respect when we see him thus prostrating the imperial dignity at the feet of the hierarchy. The penance of Theodosius was the triumph of religion over the pride and cruelty of man—a noble remorse; in Louis it was the slavery of superstition: he had lost all moral discrimination as to the nature and extent of his own guilt. The slightest act of authority against monk or priest is become a crime, reconciliation with Heaven only to be obtained by propitiating their favour.

The hierarchy failed not to discover the hour of the

<sup>7</sup> "Timebatur enim quam maximè Wala, summi apud Karolum Imperatorem habitus loci, ne forte aliquid sinistrum contra imperatorem moliretur."—Astronomus, ii. p. 618. Pertz, ii.

<sup>8</sup> "Eleemosynarum etiam largitione plurimarum, sed et servorum Christiano-

tionum instantiâ, necnon et propria satisfactione, adeo divinitatem sibi placare curabat, quasi hæc quæ super unumquemque legaliter decurrerant, sua gesta fuerant crudelitate." p. 626.

<sup>9</sup> "Venerabatur passim secundus a Cæsare."—Vit. Wala, p. 535.

monarch's weakness. At the autumnal Diet four great ecclesiastical councils were summoned to meet at Penticost in the following year, to treat of affairs of religion and the abuses of the civil power. Among the crimes which it was determined to suppress was the granting of monasteries to laymen; the grants of Church property at pleasure to the vassals of the Crown, without consent of the bishops. Thus the bishops aspired to be co-legislators in the diets, sole legislators in the councils of which themselves determined the powers.

Yet even in his prostrate humiliation before the transalpine clergy, Louis, through his son Lothair, is exercising full sovereignty over Rome. Lothair, accompanied by Wala, now at once the confidential adviser of Louis in the highest matters, had descended into Italy to command disquieted Rome into peace. He had received the crown from the obsequious Pope. Hardly, however, had Lothair recrossed the Alps when he was overtaken by hasty messengers with intelligence of new tumults.

Two men of the highest rank (Theodorus, the Primicerius of the Church, and Leo, the Nomenclator, who had held high functions at the coronation of Lothair) had been seized, dragged to the Lateran palace, blinded, and afterwards beheaded. The Pope was openly accused of this inhuman act.<sup>b</sup> Two imperial commissioners, Adelung, Abbot of St. Vedast, and Hunfrid, Count of Coire, were despatched with full powers to investigate the affair. At the same time came envoys from the Pope to the court of Louis.<sup>c</sup> The imperial commissioners were baffled in their inquiry. Paschal refused to produce the murderers; he asserted that they were guilty of no crime in putting to death men themselves guilty of treason; he secured them by throwing around them a half-sacred character as servants of the Church of St. Peter.<sup>d</sup> Himself he exculpated by a

<sup>b</sup> Both Leo and Theodorus had been sent as ambassadors by Paschal, one to the Emperor, the other to Lothair.—Eginhard. "Erant et qui dicerent, vel jussu vel consilio Paschalis Pontificis rem fuisse perpetrata."—Eginhard, *Annal.* sub ann. 823. "Qua in re fama Pontificis quoque ludebatur, dum ejus

consensui totum ascriberetur."—*Astronom.* p. 302.

<sup>c</sup> John, Bishop of Silva Candida; the librarian Sergius; Quirinus subdeacon; Leo, master of the military.

<sup>d</sup> Thegan., *Vit. Hludovic.* apud Pertz, c. 30. Eginhard sub ann.

solemn expurgatorial oath, before thirty bishops, from all participation in the deed. The Emperor received with respect the exculpation of the Pope. But Paschal was summoned before a higher judgment: he died <sup>May, 824.</sup> immediately after the arrival of the Emperor's messengers. The Romans, though Paschal had vied with his predecessor, Leo III., in his magnificent donations to the churches of Rome, would not permit his burial in the accustomed place, nor with the usual pomp.\*

The contest for the vacant see arrayed against each other the two factions in Rome under their undisguised colours. It was a strife between a trans-Alpine and a cis-Alpine, a Teutonic and a Roman interest. The patricians, the nobles of Rome, many of Lombard <sup>June, 824.</sup> blood, were in the Imperialist party; the plebeians, the commons, asserted their independence, and scorned the subservience of the Popes. They were more papal than the Popes themselves. Wala, now ruling the Emperor's counsels, had remained at Rome. By his dexterous management Eugenius prevailed over his rival, Zinzinnus; yet the presence of Lothair was demanded to overawe the city, and to maintain the Imperialist Pope.<sup>†</sup> Lothair issued his mandates in a high tone. He strongly remonstrated with the Pope against the violence and insults suffered by all who were faithful to the Emperor and friendly to the Franks. Some had been put to death, others made the laughing-stock of their enemies. There was a general clamour against the Roman pontiffs, and against the administrators of justice. By the ignorance or indolence of the popes, by the insatiable avarice of the judges, the property of many Romans had been unjustly confiscated. Lothair had determined to redress these abuses. By his supreme authority many judgments were reversed; the confiscated estates restored to their rightful owners. In other words, the Imperialist nobles obtained redress of all grievances, real or imaginary. The heads of the popular party were surrendered and sent to France. A constitution was publicly affixed on the Vati-

\* Thegan.

† "Eugenius, vincente nobilium parte, ordinatus est."—Eginhard.

can, regulating the election of the Pope, for which no one had a suffrage but a Roman of an approved title: it thus vested the election in the nobles.<sup>a</sup>

Annual reports were to be made, both to the Pope and to the Emperor, on the administration of justice. Each of the senate or people was to declare whether he would live according to the Roman, the Lombard, or the Frankish law. On the Emperor's arrival at Rome, all the great civil authorities were to pay him feudal service. There were other provisions for the maintenance of the Papal estates, and prohibiting plunder on the vacancy of the see. As a still more peremptory assertion of the Imperial supremacy, the unrepealed statute was confirmed, that no Pope should be consecrated till his election had been ratified by the Emperor. The Emperor declared his intention of sending commissioners from time to time to watch over the administration of the laws, to receive appeals, and to remedy acts of wrong or injustice.<sup>b</sup>

But while the Empire thus asserted its supremacy in Rome, beyond the Alps it was gradually sinking into decay. The vast dominions of Charlemagne, notwithstanding the decree of Aix-la-Chapelle, were severing into independent, soon to become hostile kingdoms. The Imperial power, out of which grew the unity of the whole, was losing its awful reverence. The Emperor was but one of many sovereigns, with the title, but less and less of the substance, of pre-eminent power. The royal authority itself was becoming more precarious by the rise of the great feudal aristocracy; and in the midst of, above great part of that aristocracy, the feudal clergy of France and Germany were more and more rapidly advancing in strength, wealth, and influence.

In the miserable civil wars which distracted the latter part of the reign of Louis the Pious, in the rebellions of his sons, in the degradation of the Imperial authority, the

<sup>a</sup> The Constitution in Sigonius, *Hist. Italica*; and in Holstenius; Labbe cum *Notis Binii*, p. 1541, sub ann. Bouquet.

<sup>b</sup> "Statutum est quoque juxta antiquorum morem, ut ex latere imperatoris mitterentur, qui judicariam potestatem

exercentes justitiam omni populo facerent, et tempore quo visum foret imperatori, æqua lance penderent."—Apud Bouquet, vi. 410. The Emperor Henry II. afterwards appealed to this constitution.—Ellendorf, p. 31.

bishops and abbots not merely take a prominent part, but appear as the great arbiters, as the awarders of empire, the deposers of kings.

The jealousies of the sons of Louis by his Queen Hermingard, which broke out into open insurrection, into civil wars with the father, began with the birth of his son by the Empress Judith;<sup>1</sup> and became more violent and irreconcilable as that son, afterwards Charles the Bald, advanced towards adolescence. These jealousies arose out of the apprehension, that in the partition of the Empire, according to Frankish usage confirmed by Charlemagne, on the death or demise of Louis, some share, and that more than a just share, should be extorted by the dominant influence of the beautiful stepmother from the uxorious Emperor. Louis was thought to be completely ruled by his wife and her favourite, Bernhard, Duke of Septimania. Rumours, of which it is impossible to know the truth, accused Duke Bernhard not only of swaying the counsels, but of dishonouring the bed, of his master.<sup>1</sup> The sons of Louis propagated these degrading reports, and indignantly complained that the bastard offspring of Duke Bernhard should aspire to part of their inheritance. But to Duke Bernhard the unsuspecting Louis, besides the cares of empire, entrusted the education of his son Charles. He had dismissed all his old counsellors: Abbot Elisachar, the chancellor; the chief chaplain, Hilduin; Jesse, Bishop of Amiens; and other lay officers and ministers of the court. Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, must withdraw to his diocese.<sup>2</sup> The whole time of Louis seemed to be indolently whiled away between field-sports, hunting and fishing in the forest of Ardennes, and the most rigid and punctilious religious practices.

These melancholy scenes concern Christian history no

<sup>1</sup> Charles, born June 13, 823, at Frankfort.

<sup>2</sup> "Thorun occupavit."—Vit. Walæ. Paschasius Radbert, the friend, partisan, and biographer of Wala, is the fierce accuser of the queen, the fury, the adulteress; and of Bernhard, the most factious monster, the defiler of matrons, the cruel

beast.—Vit. Walæ. "Fit palatium prostibulum, ubi mœchia dominatur, adulter regnat." Bernhard is even accused of a design to murder Louis and his sons. Thegan declares that these charges were all lies (p. 36): "Mentientes omnia."

<sup>3</sup> Compare Funck, p. 102.

further than as displaying the growing power of the clergy, the religion of Louis gradually quailing into abject superstition, the strange fusion and incorporation of civil and ecclesiastical affairs; but in this consists the peculiar and distinctive character of those times. The Church gives refuge, or punishes and incapacitates, by its disqualifying vows, the victims of political animosity. The dethroned Empress is forced into a convent; civil incapacity is not complete, at least is not absolutely binding, without ecclesiastical censure. The Pope himself appears in person: principally by his influence, Louis is abandoned by his army, and left at the mercy of his rebellious sons. The degraded monarch, recalled to his throne, will not resume his power without the removal of the ecclesiastical censure.

The first overt act of rebellion by the elder sons of Louis, chiefly Pepin (for Louis held a doubtful course, and Lothair was yet in Italy), was the refusal of the feudal army to engage in the perilous and unprofitable war in Bretagne.<sup>m</sup> Already the fond and uxorious father had awakened jealousy by assigning to the son of Judith the title of King of Alemannia.<sup>n</sup> Pepin, King of Aquitaine, placed himself at the head of the mutinous forces. The Emperor, with a few loyal followers (who, though like the rest they refused to engage in the Breton war, yet would not abandon their sovereign), lay at Compiègne, while his sons, with the mass of the army, were encamped three leagues off at Verberie. Around Pepin had assembled the discarded ecclesiastical ministers, Elisachar, Wala, Hilduin, Jesse; with Godfrey and Richard, and the Counts Warin, Lantbert, Matfrid, Hugo. The demands of the insurgents were stern and peremptory: the dismissal and punishment of Duke Bernhard, the degradation of the guilty Judith. Bernhard made his escape to the south, and took refuge in Barcelona; Judith, by the Emperor's advice, retired into the convent of St. Mary of Laon. There she was seized by the adherents of her step-sons, compelled to promise that she would use all her influence, if she had opportunity, to urge the Emperor to retire to a

<sup>m</sup> The herrban was summoned to Rennes, April 14, 830.

<sup>n</sup> Aug. 829, at Worms.

cloister.<sup>o</sup> Before herself was set the dreary alternative of death or of taking the veil. She pronounced the fatal vows; and, as a nun, edified by her repentance and piety the sisters of St. Radegond at Poitiers. To the <sup>April, 830.</sup> people she was held up as a wicked enchantress, who by her potions and by her unlawful bewitchments alone could have so swayed the soul of the pious Emperor. Lothair, the King of Italy, now joined his brothers, and approved of all their acts. Deliberations were held, in which the higher ecclesiastics Jesse, Bishop of Amiens; Hilduin, Abbot of St. Denys; Wala (by the death of his brother Adalhard now Abbot of Corbey) urged the stronger measure, the degradation of the Emperor. The sons, either from fear or respect, hesitated at this extreme course. Some of the Imperial ministers were punished; two brothers of the Empress forced to submit to the tonsure; and Heribert, brother of Duke Bernhard, blinded. In a general Diet of the Empire at Compiègne, Lothair was associated with his father in the Empire.

But the unpopularity of Louis with the Roman Gauls and with the Franks of Gaul was not shared by the German subjects of the Empire. Throughout this contest, the opposition between the Teutonic and the Gaulish Franks (the French, who now began to form a different society, a different language, with a stronger Roman character in the institutions) foreshowed the inevitable disunion which awaited the Empire of Charlemagne. In the Diet of Nimeguen the cause of the Emperor predominated so completely that Lothair would not listen to the advice of his more desperate followers to renew the war.<sup>p</sup> He yielded to the gentle influence of his father, and abandoned, with but little scruple, his own adherents and those of his brothers. The Emperor and his son appeared in public as entirely reconciled; sentence of capital condemnation was passed on all who had taken part in the proceedings at Compiègne. Jesse, Hilduin, Wala, Matfrid, and the rest were in custody; and it was the clemency of the Emperor

<sup>o</sup> "Quam usque adeo intentatam per diversi generis pœnas invite adegere, ut promitteret, se, si copia daretur cum imperatore colloquendi persuasuram quatenus Imperator abjectis armis, comisque

recisis monasterio sese conferret."—Astron. Vit. Ludov. A.D. 829.

<sup>p</sup> Funck, I think, does not make out his case of the craft of Louis: he seems to have followed rather than guided events.

rather than the interposition of Lothair in favour of his partisans which prorogued their punishment till the meeting of another Diet at Aix-la-Chapelle, summoned for the 2nd of February. Louis returned in triumph to pass the winter in that capital. His first act was to release his wife from her monastic prison. She returned from Aquitaine, but the scrupulous Emperor hesitated to restore her to her conjugal rights while the impeachment remained upon her honour, perhaps likewise on account of the vows which she had been compelled to take. On the solemn day of the purification of the Virgin, Judith appeared (no one answering the citation to accuse the Empress of adultery or witchery) to assert her own purity. The loyal assembly at once declared that no accuser appeared against her; an oath was tendered, and without further inquiry her own word was held sufficient to establish her spotless virtue. The gentle Louis seized the opportunity of mercy to commute the capital punishment of all the conspirators against his authority.<sup>9</sup> His monkish biographer rebukes his too great lenity.<sup>7</sup> The sons of Louis, humiliated, constrained to assent to the condemnation of their partisans, withdrew, each to his separate kingdom—Pepin to Aquitaine, Louis to Bavaria, Lothair to Italy. Duke Bernhard presented himself at the court at Thionville in the course of the autumn; he averred his innocence; according to the custom, defied his accusers to come forward, and prove their charge in arms. The wager of battle was not accepted, and Duke Bernhard was admitted to purge himself by oath.

A.D. 831.

Hardly more than a year elapsed, and the three sons were again in arms against their father. Louis seems now to have alienated the able Duke Bernhard, and to have surrendered himself to the undisputed rule of Gombard, a monk of St. Médard in Soissons.

The whole Empire is now divided into two hostile

<sup>9</sup> Hilduin had appeared with a great armed retinue of the vassals of the abbey of St. Denys, St. Germain de Prés, and St. Médard.—Funk, p. 111. Jesse of Amiens was deposed by a council of bishops, headed by Ebbo of Rheims; Hilduin imprisoned at Corbey; Wala in a castle on the lake of Geneva.

<sup>7</sup> Astronomus, in Vit. xlv. According to Boehmer (Regesta), Lothair and Louis were present at this diet. At this diet too appeared envoys from the Danes to implore the continuance of peace; from the Slavians, and the Caliph of Bagdad, with splendid presents. The Empire appeared still in its strength at a distance.

parties: on each side are dukes and counts, bishops and abbots. The Northern Germans espouse the cause of the Emperor; the Gaulish Franks and some of the Southern Germans obey the Kings of Aquitaine and Bavaria. Among the clergy, another element of jealousy and disunion was growing to a great height. Even under the Merovingian kings, it has been seen, the nobles had endeavoured to engross the great ecclesiastical dignities. Under the Carolingians, men of the highest rank, of the noblest descent, even the younger or illegitimate branches of the royal family, had become Churchmen; but the higher these dignitaries became, and more and more on a level with the military feudatories, the more the Nobles began to consider the ecclesiastical benefices their aristocratical inheritance and patrimony. They were indignant when men of lower or of servile birth presumed to aspire to these high places, which raised them at once to a level with the most high-born and powerful. They almost aimed at making a separate caste, to whom should belong, of right, all the larger ecclesiastical as well as temporal fiefs. But abilities, piety, learning, in some instances no doubt less lofty qualifications, would at times force their way to the highest dignities. Louis, whether from policy or from a more wise and Christian appreciation of the clerical function in the Church, was considered to favour this humbler class of ecclesiastics. One of his biographers, Thegan, himself an ecclesiastical dignitary of noble birth, thus contemptuously describes the low-born clergy:—"It was the great weakness of Louis that he did not prevent that worst of usages by which the basest slaves obtained the highest dignities of the Church. He followed the fatal example of Jeroboam, 'who made of the lowest of the people priests of the high places. . . . And this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off and to destroy it from the face of the earth.' No sooner have such men attained elevation than they throw off their meekness and humility, give loose to their passions, become quarrelsome, evil-speaking, ruling men's minds by alternate menaces and flatteries. Their first object is to raise their families from their servile condi-

tion: to some they give a good education, others they contrive to marry into noble families. No one can lead a quiet life who resents their demands and intrigues. Their relatives, thus advanced, treat the older nobles with disdain, and behave with the utmost pride and insolence. The apostolic canon is obsolete, that, if a bishop has poor relations, they should receive alms like the rest of the poor, and nothing more." Thegan devoutly wishes that God would put an end to this execrable usage.<sup>8</sup> In all this there may have been truth, but truth spoken in bitterness by the wounded pride of caste. These ecclesiastics were probably the best and the worst of the clergy. There were those who rose by the virtues of saints, by that austere and gentle piety, by that winning evangelic charity, united with distinguished abilities, which is sure of sympathy and admiration in the darkest times: and those who rose by the vices of slaves, selfishness, cunning, adulation, intrigue, by the worldly abilities which in such times so easily assume the mask of religion. Now, however, all the higher clergy, of gentle or low birth, seem to have joined the confederates against the Emperor. Ebbo of Rheims, Agobard of Lyons, Barnard of Vienne, Heribald of Auxerre, Hilduin of Beauvais, are united with Jesse of Amiens and the indefatigable Wala. Afterwards appear also, with Lothair at Compiègne, Bartholomew of Narbonne, Otgar of Mentz, Elias of Troyes, Joseph of Evreux.

At length—after many vicissitudes, hostilities, negotiations, in which Louis, under the absolute control of the ambitious Judith, seemed determined to depress his eldest sons to advance the young Charles (he had now named him King of Aquitaine)—the armies of the Emperor and of his rebellious sons (all three sons were now in arms) stood in array against each other on the plains of Rothfeld in Alsace, at no great distance from Strasburg. The Pope was announced as in the camp of the King of Italy. This Pope was Gregory IV., by birth a Roman. Eugenius had been

Civil war.  
June 20, 833.  
Pope Gregory IV.

\* "Jamdudum illa pessima consuetudo erat, ut ex vilissimis servis fiant summi Pontifices . . . et ideo omnipotens Deus cum regibus et principibus hanc

pessimam consuetudinem amodo et deinceps eradicare et suffocare dignetur, ut amplius non fiat in populo Christiano. Amen!"

succeeded by Valentinus, who died five weeks after his accession. Gregory IV. had then ascended the papal throne, with the sanction of the King of Italy, Lothair.<sup>1</sup> The Pope may have placed himself in this unseemly position, supporting rebellious sons against the authority of their father, either from the desire of courting the favour of Lothair, who was all-powerful in Italy; or, it may be hoped, with the more becoming purpose of interposing his mediation, and putting an end to this unnatural conflict.

But the Emperor Louis and the clergy of his party beheld in Gregory an avowed enemy. He addressed a strong letter to the Frankish hierarchy assembled at Worms. Gregory's answer was in the haughty tone of later times: it was suggested by Wala,<sup>2</sup> now again in the camp of the foes of Louis. But the enmity of the Pope was not so dangerous as what he called his friendly mediation. He appeared suddenly in the camp of Louis. The clergy, Fulco the chief chaplain, and the bishops, had the boldness to declare that, if he came to threaten them and their Imperial master with excommunication, they would in their turn excommunicate him, and send him back to Italy.<sup>3</sup> There were even threats that they would depose him. Even the meek Emperor received the Pope with cold courtesy, and without the usual honours. He had summoned him indeed, but rather as a vassal than a mediator. The Pope passed several days in the Imperial camp. Other influences were likewise at work. Unaccountably, imperceptibly, the army of Louis melted away like a heap of snow. The nobles, the ecclesiastics, the troops, gradually fell off and joined his sons. Louis found himself encircled only by a few faithful fol-

Field of Lias.

June 29.

<sup>1</sup> "Non prius ordinatus est, quam legatus Imperatoris Romani venit et electionem populi qualis esset examinavit." —Eginhard, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> "Unde ei dedimus (Wala, &c.) nonnulla SS. Patrum auctoritate formata prædecessorumque suorum conscripta, quibus nullus contradicere possit, quod ejus esset potestas, imo Dei et B. Petri apostoli, suæque auctoritas ire, mittere ad omnes gentes pro fide Christi, et pace ecclesiarum, pro prædicatione evangelii et assertionem veritatis, et in eo esset om-

nis auctoritas B. Petri excellens et potestas viva, a quo oporteret universos judicari ita ut ipse a nemine judicandus esset." —Vit. Walæ, xvi. It is curious to find the Pope, no humble Pope, needing this prompting from a Frankish monk, a higher High Churchman than the Pope. Yet I see nothing here of the false Decretals.

<sup>3</sup> "Sed si excommunicans advenerit, excommunicatus abiret, cum aliter se habeat antiquorum auctoritas canonum." —Thegan.

lowers.<sup>7</sup> "Go ye also to my sons," said the gentle Louis; "no one shall lose life or limb in my behalf."<sup>a</sup> Weeping they left him. Ever after this ignominious place was named Lügenfeld, the field of falsehood.<sup>a</sup>

The Emperor, Judith his Queen, and their young son Charles, were now the prisoners of Lothair. The Emperor was at first treated with some marks of respect; Judith was sent into Italy, and imprisoned in the fortress of Tortona; the boy was conveyed to the abbey of Prüm: probably on account of his youth he escaped the tonsure. The sons divided the Empire; the Pope, it is said, in great sorrow returned to Rome.<sup>b</sup>

Lothair was a man of cruelty, but he either feared or scrupled to take the life of his father. Yet he and his noble and episcopal partisans could not but dread another reaction in favour of the gentle Emperor. A Diet was held at Compiègne. They determined to incapacitate him by civil and ecclesiastical degradation for the resumption of his royal office. They compelled him to perform public penance in the church of St. Médard, at Soissons. There the Emperor, the father of three kings, before the shrine which contained the relics of St. Médard, and of St. Sebastian the Martyr, laid down upon the altar his armour and his imperial attire, put on a dark mourning robe, and read the long enforced confession of his crimes. Eight weary articles were repeated by his own lips. I. He confessed himself guilty of sacrilege and homicide, as having broken the solemn oath made on a former occasion before the clergy and the people; guilty of the blood of his kinsmen, especially of Prince Bernhard (whose punishment, extorted by the nobles, had been mitigated by Louis). II. He confessed himself guilty of perjury, not only by the violation of his own oaths, but by compelling others to forswear themselves through his frequent changes in the partition of the

Oct. 833.

Penance of  
Louis.

<sup>7</sup> Of these were four bishops, his brother Drogo of Metz, Modoin of Autun, Wilerich of Bremen, Aldric of Mons.

<sup>a</sup> "Ite ad filios meos, nolo ut ullus propter me vitam aut membra dimittat. Illi infusi lacrymis recedebant ab eo."—Thegan, c. xlii.

<sup>a</sup> "Qui ab eo quod ibi gestum est perpetuus est ignominia notatus ut vocetur campus mentitus."—Astronom. Vit. Thegan calls it "campus mendacii."

<sup>b</sup> "Cum maximo mœrore."—Astronom. Vit.

Empire. **III.** He confessed himself guilty of a sin against God, by having made a military expedition during Lent, and having held a Diet on a high festival. **IV.** He confessed himself guilty of severe judgments against the partisans of his sons—whose lives he had spared by his merciful intervention! **V.** He confessed himself again guilty of encouraging perjury, by permitting especially the Empress Judith to clear herself by an oath. **VI.** He confessed himself guilty of all the slaughter, pillage, and sacrilege committed during the civil wars. **VII.** He confessed himself guilty of having excited those wars by his arbitrary partitions of the Empire. **VIII.** And lastly, of having, by his general incapacity, brought the Empire, of which he was the guardian, to a state of total ruin. Having rehearsed this humiliating lesson, the Emperor laid the parchment on the altar, was stripped of his military belt, which was likewise placed there; and having put off his worldly dress, and assumed the garb of a penitent, was esteemed from that time incapacitated from all civil acts.

The most memorable part of this memorable transaction is, that it was arranged, conducted, accomplished in the presence and under the authority of the <sup>The clergy.</sup> clergy. The permission of Lothair is slightly intimated; but the act was avowedly intended to display the strength of the ecclesiastical power, the punishment justly incurred by those who are disobedient to sacerdotal admonition.\* Thus the hierarchy assumed cognisance not over the religious delinquencies alone, but over the civil misconduct of the sovereign. They imposed an ecclesiastical penance, not solely for his asserted violation of his oaths before the altar, but for the ruin of the Empire. It is strange to see the pious sovereign, the one devout and saintly of his race, thus degraded by these haughty Churchmen, now, both high-born and low-born, concurring against him. The Pope had ostensibly, perhaps sincerely, hoped to reconcile the conflicting parties. His mission may have been designed as one of peace, but the inevitable conse-

\* "Manifestare juxta injunctum nobis ministerium curavimus, qualis sit vigor et potestas sive ministerium sacerdotale, et quali mereatur damnari scutentiâ, qui

monitis sacerdotalibus obedire noluerit."  
—Acta Exautorationis Ludov. Pii, apud Bouquet, v. p. 243.

quence of his appearance in the rebellious camp could not but be to the disadvantage of Louis. He seemed at least to befriend the son in his unnatural warfare against his father. Agobard, Bishop of Lyons, issued a fierce apology for the rebellious sons of Louis, filled with accusations of incontinence against the Empress Judith.<sup>d</sup> Her beauty and the graces of her manner had even seduced the admiration of holy priests and bishops towards this Dalilah, who had dared to resume her royal dignity and conjugal rights after having taken the veil; to her he attributes all the weaknesses of the too easy monarch. In the words of the aristocratic Thegan, all the bishops were the enemies of Louis, especially those whom he had raised from a servile condition, or who were sprung from barbarous races. But there was one on whom Thegan pours out all his indignation. One was chosen, an impure and most inhuman man, to execute their cruel decrees, a man of servile origin, Ebbo, the Archbishop of Rheims. "Unheard-of words! Unheard-of deeds! They took the sword from his thigh; by the judgment of his servants he was clad in sackcloth; the prophecy of Jeremiah was fulfilled—'Slaves have ruled over us.'<sup>e</sup> Oh, what a return for his goodness! He made thee free, noble he could not, for that an enfranchised slave cannot be. He clothed thee in purple and in pall, thou clothedst him in sackcloth; he raised thee to the highest bishopric, thou by unjust judgment hast expelled him from the throne of his ancestors. . . . . O Lord Jesus! where was thy destroying angel when these things were done?" Thegan goes on to quote Virgil, and says that the poet would want the combined powers of Homer, Virgil, and Ovid to describe the guilt of these deeds. The miseries of Louis were greater than those of Job himself. The comforters of Job were kings, those of Louis slaves.<sup>f</sup>

It is astonishing to find that this was the same Ebbo,

<sup>d</sup> "Domina Palatii . . . ludat pueriliter, spectantibus etiam aliquibus de ordine sacerdotali et plerisque conludentibus, qui secundum formam quam apostolus scribat de eligendis episcopis . . ."

<sup>e</sup> Lamentat. v. 8.

<sup>f</sup> "Qui beato Job insultabant Reges fuisse leguntur in libro beati Thobias; qui illum vero affligebant, legales ejus servi erant, et patrum suorum."—Thegan. Vit. Ludov. xliv.

Archbishop of Rheims, who undertook a perilous mission to the heathen Northmen, brought the Danish King to the court of Louis to receive baptism, and is celebrated by the monkish poet of the day in the most glowing strains for his saintly virtues.<sup>a</sup>

This strange and sudden revolution, which had left the Emperor at the mercy of his son, was followed by another no less sudden and strange. No doubt the pride of many warlike nobles was insulted by this display of ecclesiastical presumption. The degradation of the Emperor was the degradation of the Empire. The character of Louis, however, could not but command the fond attachment of many. The people felt the profoundest sympathy in his fate; and even among the clergy there were those who could not but think these insults an ungracious and unchristian return for his piety to God, his tenderness to man, his respect for the ecclesiastical order.<sup>b</sup> A revulsion took place in the whole nation. The other sons of the Emperor, Pepin and Louis, had taken no part in this humiliation of their father, and expressed their strong commiseration of his sufferings, their reprobation of the cruelty and insult heaped upon him. The murmurs of the people were too loud to be mistaken. Leaving his father at St. Denys, Lothair fled to Burgundy. No sooner had he retired than the whole Empire seemed to assemble, in loyal emulation, around the injured Louis.

But Louis would not resume his power, and his arms, the symbol of his power, but with the consent of the Bishops. His subjects' reviving loyalty could not remove the ecclesiastical incapacitation. But bishops were not wanting among those who thronged to renew their allegiance.<sup>1</sup> Louis was solemnly regirt with his arms by the hands of some of these prelates, and, amid the universal joy of the people, the Pious resumed

A.D. 834.  
March 1.

<sup>a</sup> Ermoldi Nigelli, Carm. iv. Ermoldus makes Louis deliver a charge to Ebbo, when setting out to convert the Normans. Munter, Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums in Dänemark und Norwegen, has collected the passages about Ebbo's mission.—Page 238 *et seqq.*

<sup>b</sup> Nithard says, "Plebs autem non modica, quæ præsens erat, etiamque

Lothario pro patre vim inferre volebat." —Apud Bouquet, p. 13. The Astronomer says on one occasion, "Miserratio tamen hujusce rei et talis rerum permutationis, exceptis authoribus, omnes habebat."—c. 39.

<sup>1</sup> Among these, Otgar of Mentz, who had been present at his penance in Soissons.

the Empire. So great was the burst of feeling, that, in the language of his biographer, the very elements seemed to sympathise in the deliverance of the Emperor from his unnatural son. The weather, which had been wet and tempestuous, became clear and serene. Once more the Empress Judith returned to court;\* and Louis might again enjoy his quiet hunting and fishing, and his ascetic usages, in the forest of Ardennes. Yet it was not a bloodless revolution. The armies of Louis and Lothair encountered near Châlons. That unfortunate town was burned

by the victorious Lothair, whose savage ferocity did not spare even females. Not content with the massacre of a son of Duke Bernhard in cold blood, his sister was dragged from her convent, shut up in a wine-cask, and thrown into the Saone.<sup>m</sup>

But the year after a pestilence made such ravages in the army of Lothair, that he was obliged to return into Italy. Before long he had to deplore the death of almost all his great trans-Alpine partisans, Wala, Count Hugo, Matfrid, Jesse of Amiens. During this time a Diet at Thionville had annulled the proceedings of that at Compiègne. In a solemn assembly at

Metz, eight archbishops<sup>n</sup> and thirty-five bishops condemned the acts of themselves and their rebellious brethren at that assembly. In the cathedral of Metz, seven archbishops chanted the seven prayers of reconciliation, and the Emperor was then held to be absolutely reinvested in his civil and religious supremacy. At a later Diet at Cremieux, near Lyons, Ebbo of Rheims (the chief chaplain, Fulco, the faithful adherent of Louis, who

had defied the Pope in his cause, aspired to the metropolitan see), submitted to deposition.<sup>o</sup> He was imprisoned in the abbey of Fulda. Yet Rome must be consulted before the degradation is complete, at all events before the successor is consecrated. Agobard of Lyons was condemned. The Archbishop of Vienne

\* The empress was brought from Tortona by officious nobles, eager to merit the gratitude of the restored emperor.

<sup>m</sup> "More maleficorum," says Nithard.

No doubt the punishment of a witch.—Apud Bouquet, p. 13.

<sup>n</sup> Metz, Treves, Rouen, Tours, Sens, Bourges, Arles, even Ebbo of Rheims.

<sup>o</sup> Funck, p. 153, with authorities.

appeared not; he incurred sentence of deposition for his contumacy. The Archbishop of Narbonne, and other bishops, were deposed. A new division of the Empire took place at a later diet at Worms, in which Lothair received only Italy: the Transalpine dominions were divided between the three other sons, Pepin, Louis, and Charles; the Empress Judith secured the first step to equality in favour of her son.<sup>p</sup>

The few remaining years of the life of Louis were still distracted by the unallayed feuds in his family. A visit of devotion to Rome was prevented by a descent of the Normans, who had long ravaged the coasts of France. A new partition was made at Nimeguen; Charles was solemnly crowned. The Empress Judith contrived to bring about a reconciliation between Lothair and his father, to the advantage of her own son Charles,<sup>q</sup> and a division of interests between Lothair and his brothers, Louis of Bavaria and Pepin of Aquitaine. Pepin, King of Aquitaine, died, and the claims of his children to the succession were disregarded. Judith knit still closer the alliance of the Emperor and the elder son. Yet one more partition. With the exception of Bavaria, with which Louis was obliged to be content, the Empire was divided between Lothair and the son of Judith.

The death of Louis was in harmony with his life. In a state of great weakness (an eclipse of the sun had thrown him into serious alarm, and from that day he began to fail<sup>r</sup>), he persisted in strictly observing the forty days of Lent; the Eucharist was his only food. Almost his last words were expressive of forgiveness to his son Louis, who was in arms against him,<sup>s</sup> and "bringing down his grey hairs in sorrow to the grave." He continued, while he had strength, to hold the crucifix, which contained a splinter of the true cross, to his breast; when

<sup>p</sup> Carta Divisionis, Bouquet, vi. 411; compare Funck, 158, 9.

<sup>q</sup> Astronomus, l. ii. Nithard, p. 14, lib. i.

<sup>r</sup> Annales Francorum, Fuldenses, Bertiniani, sub ann.

<sup>s</sup> Louis of Bavaria had not rushed into war without provocation. The Emperor had at least sanctioned the last partition, which left him a narrow kingdom, while Lothair and his younger brother shared the realm of Charlemagne.

his strength failed, he left that office to Drogo, Bishop of Metz, his natural brother, who, with the Archbishops of Treves and Mentz, attended his dying hours. His last words were the German *aus, aus*. His attendants supposed that he was bidding an evil spirit, of whose presence he was conscious, *avaunt*. He then lifted up his eyes to heaven, and, with serenity approaching to a smile, expired.<sup>1</sup>

June 20,  
A.D. 840.

Christian history has dwelt at some length on the life of this monarch. His appellation, the Pious, shows what the religion was which was held in especial honour in his day, its strength and its weakness, its virtue, and what in a monarch can hardly escape the name of vice. It displays the firmer establishment of a powerful and aristocratic clergy, not merely in that part of Europe which became the French monarchy, but also in great part of trans-Rhenane Germany; the manner in which they attained and began to exercise that power; the foundation, in short, of great national Churches, in acknowledged subordination, if not always in rigid obedience, to the See of Rome, but also mingling, at times with overruling weight, in all the temporal affairs of each kingdom.

But throughout the reign of Louis the Pious, not only did the Empire assert this supremacy in ecclesiastical as in temporal affairs; Teutonic independence maintained its ground, more perhaps than its ground, on the great question of image-worship. The Council of

Image wor-  
ship in the  
West.

Paris enforced the solemn decree of the Council of Frankfort. The Iconoclastic Byzantine Emperor, Michael the Stammerer, entered into negotiations with the Western Emperor, of which the manifest object was to compel the Pope at least to amity, and to recede from the decrees of the second Council of Nicæa asserted by his predecessors. The ambassadors of Constantinople appeared in Rome, accompanied by ambassadors from Louis. The Pope Eugenius, who owed his Popedom to the Franks, who sat on his throne only through their support, was in great embarrassment; he was obliged to elude what he dared not oppose. At no other time could a bishop

A.D. 824.

<sup>1</sup> Louis died on an island of the Rhine, opposite to Ingelheim.

like Claudius of Turin have acted the fearless Iconoclast in an Italian city, removed all images and pictures, condemned even the cross, and lived and died, if not unassailed by angry controversialists, yet unrebuked by any commanding authority, undegraded, and in the full honours of a Bishop. Claudius was a Spaniard who acquired fame as a commentator on the Scriptures in the court of Louis at Aquitaine. Among the first acts of Louis as Emperor was the promotion of Claudius to the bishopric of Turin. The stern reformer at once began to wage war on what he deemed the superstitions of the people. Claudius went much further than the temperate decrees of the Council of Frankfort. Images were to him idols; the worship of the cross godlessness. Turin was overawed by his vigorous authority. A strong party, not the most numerous, espoused his cause. He was not unopposed. The Abbot Theodemir, of a monastery near Nismes; Dunglas, a Scot, a learned theologian of Pavia; Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, denounced his doctrines. But Theodemir ingenuously confesses that most of the great transalpine prelates thought with Claudius.\* Agobard of Lyons published a famous treatise, if not in defence of Claudius, maintaining in their utmost strength the decrees of Frankfort.

But it was not on image-worship alone that Claudius of Turin advanced opinions premature and anticipative of later times. The apostolic office of St. Peter ceased with the life of St. Peter. The power of the keys passed to the whole episcopal order. The Bishop of Rome had apostolic power only in so far as he led an apostolic life.

It is difficult to suppose but that some tradition or succession to the opinions of Claudius of Turin lay concealed in the valleys of the Piedmontese Alps, to appear again after many centuries.

---

\* Gförrer, 111, p. 736.

## CHAPTER III.

## SARACENS IN ITALY.

THE Carolingian Empire expired with Louis the Pious. It separated, not so much into three kingdoms, as into three nations. Germany, France, and Italy, though governed each by a descendant of Charlemagne, and for a short time re-united under the sceptre of Charles the Fat, began to diverge more widely in their social institutions, in their form of government, in the manners and character of the people.

The imperial title was, in general, assumed by that one of the sons or grandsons of Louis the Pious who was master of Italy. First Lothair, and then his son, Louis II., was Emperor, King of Italy, and Sovereign of the city of Rome. The right to ratify, if not the election, the consecration of the Pope, was among the imperial privileges asserted with the greatest rigour and determination.<sup>a</sup> At the close of the uneventful pontificate of Gregory IV.,—uneventful as far as the affairs of Rome, not uneventful to those who could discern the slow but steady advancement of hierarchical pretensions<sup>b</sup>—the Emperor Lothair heard with indignation that the clergy and people of Rome had elected Sergius II., a Roman of noble birth, and from his youth trained in ecclesiastical duties; and that Sergius, contrary to the solemn treaty, had been at once consecrated, without awaiting his good pleasure.<sup>c</sup> The Romans had expelled John, a deacon, chosen by some of the low and rustic people.<sup>d</sup> The haughty nobles had insisted on the condemnation of the audacious usurper. Sergius interposed to save his life. Again, we see the commonalty and the

<sup>a</sup> Annal. Bertiniani.

<sup>b</sup> See the famous letter of Gregory IV. ad Episcopos, written, it should seem, under the influence of the Abbot Wala. See note, p. 331.

<sup>c</sup> Anastasius, Vit. Sergii; Annal. Bertin. ad an. 844.

<sup>d</sup> "Imperito et agresti populo."—Vit. Serg.

nobles in fierce strife; but the nobles, grown haughty, are less humbly imperialist. Lothair despatched immediately his son Louis with an army, and accompanied by Drogo Bishop of Metz, to punish, perhaps to degrade, the presumptuous prelate. The Franks, whose natural ferocity had not been abated by years of civil war, as if to show the resentment of the emperor, committed frightful ravages. From the borders of the Roman territory to Bologna they advanced, wasting as they went, towards Rome. But Pope Sergius knew the strength of his position, and put forth all his religious grandeur to control the mind of the young invader. A fortunate tempest had already shaken the minds of the Franks: some of the followers of the Bishop of Metz had been struck dead by lightning, but still the army advanced with menacing haste.\*

Nine miles from the city Louis was met by the civil authorities, with banners flying and loud acclamations, the military *schools*, or bands, and the people under their various standards, chanting hymns and songs of welcome. As he came nearer, the sacred crosses, which were usually reserved to grace the entrance of the Emperor into the city, were seen advancing Louis, son of Lothair, in Rome. towards him. Louis was seized with pious fear and joy at these unexpected honours. On the steps up to the church of St. Peter he was met and embraced by the pope. They proceeded, Louis at the right hand of the pope, to the silver-plated doors of the church, which, however, were jealously closed. Then the Pope, by the suggestion, it was said, of the Holy Ghost, addressed the king,—“Comest thou with a pure heart and mind for the welfare of the republic, and of the whole world, and of this Church? If so, I will command that the gates be opened; if otherwise, never, with my consent, shalt thou enter therein.” The king protested that he came with no hostile or evil intent. At the touch of the prelate the doors flew open, the whole clergy burst out in the ac-

\* “Hoc videntes horribile signum deponentes, atroci voluntate ad urbem nimis omnes timore Franci correpti velociter properabant.”—Vit. Sergii.  
sunt. Sed nullatenus mente ferocitatem

cordant chant, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The Frank army, in the mean time, were

not permitted to enter the city, the gates of which  
June 15. were strongly guarded by the militia of Rome.

A few days after Louis was anointed King of Lombardy. The Franks insisted on the Pope and the patricians of Rome swearing fealty to the king. They resolutely refused to acknowledge any allegiance but to the Emperor himself.

The degraded archbishops, Ebbo of Rheims, Bartholomew of Narbonne, prayed to be restored to their sees and their honours; but Drogo of Metz, the brother and faithful adherent of Louis the Pious, was at the head of the Frankish army. The Pope would grant them the humiliating permission to communicate, but to communicate only with the common people. Drogo, Bishop of Metz, son of the glorious Emperor Charles the Great, was appointed with the fullest powers Vicar of the Pope beyond the Alps.<sup>f</sup>

Sergius died after a pontificate of three years. An unforeseen necessity enforced the immediate election  
Jan. 27, 847.  
Leo IV. of his successor, Leo IV.<sup>g</sup> The impulse of Mohammedan invasion against the still narrowing boundaries of Christendom had by no means ceased. The Saracen fleets were masters of the Mediterranean. Sicily, with the

exception of Syracuse, which made a gallant  
Saracen invasions. defence for some years, was in their hands.<sup>h</sup>

They had conquered Calabria, were rapidly advancing northwards, and subduing the parts of the province which still owned allegiance to the Byzantine Empire.<sup>i</sup> Rome herself beheld the Moslemin at her gates; the suburban churches of St. Peter and St. Paul were plundered; the capital of Christendom was in danger of becoming a Mo-

<sup>f</sup> Vit. Sergii.

<sup>g</sup> It is observed that under Leo IV. the form of address of the papal letters is changed. With two exceptions, the name of the person addressed is placed after that of the Pope: the title Dominus is dropped.—Garnier, in Not. ad Lib. Pontif. Planck, iii. p. 29.

<sup>h</sup> The progress of the Saracens was aided by the feuds among the Lombard

dukes. The princes of Spoleto and Benevento and Naples had been at continual war with each other. For details, see Anonym. Salernit.

<sup>i</sup> Famin (*Histoire des Invasions des Sarrasins en Italie*) describes the conquest of Sicily, and the first invasions of Italy, c. iv.—Annal. Met. Annal. Bertin, sub ann. 846. Baronius sub ann.

hammedan city.<sup>k</sup> The Moslemin retired on the advance of an army of Franks, according to some authorities, under the command of King Louis himself; but they retreated only to inflict a shameful defeat on the Christians, and then sate down to besiege Gaeta. The great riches of the monastery of Monte Cassino escaped only by an opportune rising of the river Garigliano, attributed by the grateful monks to a miracle.<sup>m</sup>

But these terrible strangers might at any time return to invest the city of St. Peter. Whether to avert the danger by his prayers, to summon the Frank Protector with more commanding voice, or to strengthen the city by his administration, a Pope appeared instantly necessary to the nobles, clergy, and people of Rome.<sup>n</sup> With the utmost haste, but with reservation of the imperial rights, infringed only on account of the exigencies of the time, Leo IV. was elected, consecrated, and assumed the functions of pope. The Romans were released from their immediate terrors by the destruction of the Saracen fleet in a tempest off Gaeta. Another legend ascribed this disaster to the insulted and plundered apostles.<sup>o</sup>

Jan. 847.

Leo's first care was to provide for the future security of the Vatican and the church of St. Peter. He carried out the design, before entertained by Leo III., of forming a new suburb, surrounded by strong fortifications, on the left bank of the Tiber, which might at once protect the most hallowed edifice of Christendom, and receive the fugitives who might be driven from the city by hostile incursions, perhaps by civil insurrections. This part of Rome perpetuated the name of the pope, as the Leonine city.

The eight years of Leo's papacy<sup>p</sup> were chiefly occupied in strengthening, in restoring the plundered and dese-

<sup>k</sup> Famin, p. 199.

<sup>m</sup> The abbey, however, had already been plundered by Siconulf, Duke of Benevento, on pretence of employing its wealth in the wars against the Saracens. The whole account is minute and curious. Anonym. Salern. apud Muratori, Script. Ital., p. 266. According to Famin, it was taken and plundered A.D. 844; yet he quotes the statement of Baronius, which implies that it was first threatened

by the Saracens in 846.—Baronius sub aun.

<sup>n</sup> "Hoc timore et futuro casu perterriti, cum sine permissione principis consecraverant: fidem quoque illius, sive honorem, post Deum per omnia et in omnibus conservantes."—Anastas. in Vit. Leon. IV.

<sup>o</sup> Baronius in loc.

<sup>p</sup> Leo died A.D. 855, July 17.

crated churches of the two apostles, and adorning Rome. The succession to Leo IV. was contested between Benedict III., who commanded the suffrages of the clergy and people, and Anastasius, who, at the head of an armed faction, seized the Lateran, stripped Benedict of his pontifical robes, and awaited the confirmation of his violent usurpation by the Imperial Legates, whose influence he thought that he had secured. But these Commissioners, after strict investigation, decided in favour of Benedict. Anastasius was expelled with disgrace from the Lateran, his rival consecrated in the presence of the emperor's representatives. Anastasius, with unwonted mercy, was only degraded to lay communion.

The pontificate of Benedict III. is memorable chiefly for the commencement of the long strife between Ignatius and Photius for the see of Constantinople. This strife ended in the permanent schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## NICOLAS I. IGNATIUS AND PHOTIUS.

NICOLAS I., the successor of Benedict, was chosen rather by the favour of the Emperor Louis and his nobles than that of the clergy.\* He has been <sup>April, A.D. 858.</sup> thought worthy to share the appellation of the Great with Leo I., with Gregory I., with Hildebrand, and with Innocent III. At least three great events signalised the pontificate of Nicolas I.,—the strife of Photius with Ignatius for the archiepiscopal throne of Constantinople; the prohibition of the divorce of King Lothair from his Queen Theutberga; and the humiliation of the great prelates on the Rhine, the successful assertion of the papal supremacy even over Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. In the first two of these momentous questions, the contest about the see of Constantinople and that of Lothair, King of Lorraine, with his wife Theutberga, Nicolas took his stand on the great eternal principles of justice, humanity, and sound morals. These were no questions of abstruse and subtle theology nor the assertion of dubious rights. In both cases the Pope was the protector of the feeble and the oppressed, the victims of calumny and of cruelty. The Bishop of Constantinople, unjustly deposed, persecuted, exiled, treated with the worst inhumanity, implored the judgment of the head of Western Christendom. A queen, not only deserted by a weak and cruel husband, but wickedly and falsely criminated by a council of bishops, obtained a hearing at the Court of Rome: her innocence was vindicated, her accusers punished, the king himself compelled to bow before the majesty of justice, made more venerable by religion. If in both cases the language of Nicolas was haughty and imperious, it was justified to the

\* Prudent. Trecens. apud Pertz, i. 142. Vit. Nicolai I.

ears of men by the goodness of his cause. The lofty supremacy which he asserted over the see of Byzantium awoke no jealousy, being exerted in behalf of a blameless and injured prelate. If he treated the royal dignity of France with contempt, it had already become contemptible in the eyes of mankind; if he annulled by his own authority the decree of a national council, composed of the most distinguished prelates of Gaul, that council had already been condemned by all who had natural sympathies with justice and with innocence. Yet, though in both cases Nicolas displayed equal ability and resolution in the cause of right, the event of the two affairs was very different. The dispute concerning the Patriarchate of Constantinople ended in the estrangement, the alienation, the final schism between the East and West. It was the last time that the Pope was permitted authoritatively to interfere in the ecclesiastical affairs of the East. The excommunication of the Greek by the Latin Church was the final act of separation. In the West Nicolas established a precedent for control even over the private morals of princes. The vices of kings, especially those of France, became the stronghold of papal influence: injured queens and subjects knew to what quarter they might recur for justice or for revenge. And on this occasion the pope brought not only the impotent king, but the powerful clergy of Lorraine, beneath his feet. The great Bishops of Cologne and of Treves were reduced to abject humiliation.

The contention for the Patriarchate of Constantinople was, chiefly speaking, no religious controversy,—it was the result of political intrigue and personal animosity. Ignatius, who became the Patriarch, was of imperial descent. In the revolution which dethroned his father, Michael Rhangabe, he had taken refuge, under the cowl of a monk, from the jealousy of Leo the Armenian. The monasteries in the islands of Platos, Hyathos, and Terebinthus, were peopled by the devout followers of Ignatius. They were the refuge of all who were persecuted for the worship of images; and to Ignatius, during that reign, the monkish and anti-Iconoclastic party looked up as a protector and

a model of the austere virtue.<sup>b</sup> From these peaceful solitudes he had been summoned by the Empress Theodora, the mother and guardian of the Emperor Michael III. the Drunkard, to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. His devout zeal led him to rebuke the Cæsar Bardas for his incestuous life. Bardas had divorced his own wife, and lived publicly with his son's widow. Ignatius openly repelled him from the communion. So long as the Empress Theodora, the sister of Bardas, protected the Patriarch, the Cæsar had no hope of vengeance; his ambition as well as his vindictiveness urged him to involve them both in common ruin. He persuaded the young Emperor no longer to endure the disgrace of female rule; and, in order to secure the full exercise of authority, counselled him to remove not only his imperious mother, and even his sisters, from the Court, but to seclude them altogether from the world. The Patriarch was commanded to dedicate these unwilling votaries to a religious life. Ignatius appealed to the canons of the Church, which allowed no one to take the vows but of their own free will; and steadily resisted the Imperial commands. A groundless charge was soon invented of treasonable correspondence with a pretender to the Empire. Ignatius was banished to his old retreat in the island of Terebinthus. As no power or persuasion could induce him to resign his patriarchal dignity, he was declared to be deposed, and a new Patriarch appointed in his place.

Nov. 23, 857.

Photius was chosen as his successor. Of illustrious birth,<sup>c</sup> having discharged all the great offices of the State with consummate ability, and risen to its very highest dignity, Photius was esteemed the most learned and accomplished man of his age. In grammar, oratory, even in physical science, in every branch of knowledge and letters, except poetry, he stood alone. His ambition was boundless as his industry and learning; and his acceptance of the Patriarchal See may show the transcendent

<sup>b</sup> It must be remembered that our chief authority is Nicetas, the biographer of Ignatius, as fervent an admirer as any adoring hagiologist.

<sup>c</sup> The patriarch Tarasius was his uncle; another uncle had married the sister of the Empress Theodora and of Bardas.

estimation in which ecclesiastical dignity was held in the East as in the West. Photius was but a layman : in six successive days he passed through the inferior orders up to the Patriarchate.

The bishops, it is said, assented to the elevation of Photius on the express condition that he should treat his deposed rival with respect and generosity. But so long as Ignatius had not consented to resign his See, the tenure of the Bishopric was insecure. Ignatius and the bishops of his party suffered every kind of wanton cruelty ; their sacred persons were not revered ; some were beaten and exiled to remote and inhospitable parts of the Empire. One accused of too great liberty of speech had his tongue cut out.<sup>d</sup> The high-born and blameless Patriarch himself was seized, carried away from his splendid and peaceful monastery, loaded with chains, hurried from one desolate place to another, and at last confined in Mitylene. Rival councils met, and the two Patriarchs were alternately excommunicated by the adverse spiritual factions.

Photius was the first to determine on an appeal to Rome. The Pope, he thought, would hardly resist the acknowledgment of his superiority, with the tempting promise of the total extirpation of the hated Iconoclasts. The Emperor sent a solemn embassy, entreating that Legates might be commissioned to assist him in his holy work, and to restore the decaying discipline. On the part of Photius four bishops were sent to assure the Pope that Ignatius, oppressed by age and infirmities, had retired from the Bishopric ; that in his retirement he was treated with profound respect ; that Photius had been lawfully chosen to the vacant See. He added the most humble asseverations of his own conscious unworthiness, and the strong reluctance with which he had undertaken the awful function. "The clergy, the bishops, the emperor, benignant to all, cruel to me alone, without listening to my entreaties, untouched by my tears, have compelled me to bear this heavy burthen."<sup>e</sup>

<sup>d</sup> Photius, in a remarkable letter to the Cæsar, deprecates in the strongest terms these barbarities.—Epist. vi.

<sup>e</sup> Photii, Epist. i. ad Nicol. Papam. It has been reprinted in a *Vie de Photius*, by the Abbé Jager, one of those modern

Nicolas was no doubt better acquainted than was supposed with the state of ecclesiastical affairs in the East. He answered with caution and dignity, that his legates could only judge on the spot as to the validity of the very questionable ordination of Photius. In the presence of his legates and a lawful council Ignatius must acknowledge his resignation. In his reply to the emperor, Nicolas seized the opportunity of re-<sup>Sept. 25, 860.</sup> claiming the estates of the Church in Sicily, and the jurisdiction over Illyricum, Epirus, Thessaly, and other parts of Greece, which had been usurped by the Archbishop of Thessalonica. Throughout the behaviour and language of Nicolas there is no sign of admitted subjection to the Eastern emperor: even its tradition seems forgotten. He writes as a great independent religious potentate, as the head of Christendom, treating the Emperor at first with the courtesy becoming a powerful sovereign, but not as one to whom himself owed allegiance.

The legates, with this calm and guarded reply, arrived at Constantinople, to the disappointment of Photius and of the Emperor. Photius was indignant that he was not acknowledged under his title of bishop; the Emperor received the legates, not as ambassadors from a foreign power, but as insolent subjects. They were imprisoned, threatened with banishment: they yielded to these sterner or to milder means of persuasion, to direct bribery.<sup>f</sup> Ignatius was summoned to appear before a council in the presence of the papal legates. This council boasted that it was formed of exactly the same number of prelates which sate in the venerable assembly at Nicea. The Patriarch's <sup>A.D. 862.</sup> firmness for a time stayed the proceedings. He demanded who the legates were, and for what purpose they sate in

French works which would disdain the praise of candour and impartiality. I shall not accuse him of it. But M. Jager has the merit of justly appreciating the high merit of Photius, for his day most unusually accomplished as a scholar; and the extraordinary beauty of some of his letters, a merit very rare in Greek literature.

<sup>f</sup> Anastasius (in Vit. Nicolai I.) and the Pope himself (Epist. x. ad Clerum

Constantin.) assert distinctly that they were bribed. The most extraordinary menace was, that not only they should suffer exile, but be food for vermin from their own bodies. "Longa exilia et diuturnas pediculorum comessationes." This might seem beneath the dignity of history, were it not in the Pope's own letter, and so, it should seem, rests on the authority of the Legates themselves.—Also, Phot. Epist. vi. p. 286.

Constantinople? They replied that they were the legates of Nicolas, the supreme pontiff, sent to judge his cause.<sup>s</sup> "First," answered the intrepid Patriarch, who appeared in the garb of a simple monk, "drive out the adulterer. If ye cannot, ye are no judges." He appealed to the Pope in person. The council pronounced his deposition; and as it were, to propitiate the Pope, in their second session condemned Iconoclasm. But this was not enough. Still every means of persuasion and cruelty were used to extort the resignation of Ignatius.<sup>a</sup> At length, it is said, while he lay senseless in his prison, his unconscious hand was forced to trace the sign of a cross on a blank paper, on which Photius superscribed a confession of his uncanonical election to the Patriarchate, which he had ruled as an usurper and a tyrant. In possession of this document, Photius allowed his rival a short interval of repose.<sup>1</sup> He was permitted to retire to a palace which had belonged to his mother. Rumours of new and more horrible persecutions meditated against him induced him to fly from the capital.<sup>k</sup> He found means to baffle his pursuers; till an earthquake, as in the time of his great predecessor, Chrysostom, shook Constantinople with guilty dread, and seemed the voice of Heaven rebuking the unjust usage of the Patriarch. He was permitted to return to the city.

In the mean time the sentence of his deposition by the Synod of Constantinople had been communicated to the Pope, with a letter of great length from Photius.<sup>n</sup> The

<sup>s</sup> The Legates suppressed the parts of the Pope's letter which warned them to decide nothing, and read only that which related to the Iconoclasts.

<sup>a</sup> If we are to believe the monkish writers, the cruelty of all orders even to ecclesiastics of the highest rank shows a most savage state of manners. The ingenious tortures inflicted on Ignatius, it is said, by command of the Emperor and of Photius, are absolutely revolting. Another respectable prelate, who had been Bishop of Crete at the time of the Saracen conquest, now become Bishop of Thessalonica, ventured during an earthquake to remonstrate with the young Emperor against his profane mimicry of the religious ceremonies of the Church, he was beaten so as to knock out two of

his teeth, and scourged almost to death. —Nicet. Vit. Ignat., Labbe, p. 1218.

<sup>1</sup> Photius is accused of forgery, or of conniving at the forgery of two favourable letters from the Pope. The trick was detected by the Cæsar Bardas. —Nicet. in Vit.

<sup>k</sup> Among the cruelties and insults which Photius is charged with heaping on his rival, he is said to have given him up shamelessly to the mockery of mimes and stage-players. "Et ad illudendum mimis et scenicis inverecundè prodere." —Nicol. ad Phot. Epist. x. p. 372.

<sup>n</sup> Part of this letter is striking and beautiful. Photius describes, with seeming sincerity, the enjoyments of his state as a layman, in the society of his attached friends and the quiet study of letters,

Pope took at once the highest ground. He summoned a council of the Roman Church; disclaimed his weak and unauthorised legates, and in the presence of the imperial ambassador refused his consent to the deposal of Ignatius, to the elevation of Photius.

Not merely did he address two lofty and condemnatory letters to the emperor and to Photius, but a third, also, to "the faithful in the East," at the close of <sup>A.D. 862.</sup> which he made known to the three Eastern Patriarchs his steadfast resolution to maintain the cause of Ignatius, to refuse the recognition of the usurper Photius. He called upon them to concur in the decrees of the Apostolic See.

Early in the next year a monk named Theognetus, a messenger of Ignatius, appeared in Rome with the full account of all the hard usage endured by his master. A more august council was now sum- <sup>A.D. 863.</sup> moned, of which the first act was to degrade and excommunicate Zacharias, one of the papal legates, for his weakness in consenting to the deposition of Ignatius. The Pope then pronounced the unanimous sentence of condemnation against Photius, recounting his offences; and involving under the same anathema <sup>Decree against Photius.</sup> Gregory, Bishop of Syracuse, who had presumed to consecrate the usurper of the Constantinopolitan See.\* All the acts of Photius, especially his ordinations, were declared null and void. The restoration of Ignatius was commanded even in more imperious language, and under more awful sanctions. "We, by the power committed to us by our Lord through St. Peter, restore our brother Ignatius to his former station, to his see, to his dignity as Patriarch, and to all the honours of his office. Whoever,

and his profound regret that he had abandoned those more congenial occupations. *ἔβρισεν εἰρημικῆς ζωῆς, ἔβρισεν γαλήνης γλυκύνιας. ἔβρισεν δὲ καὶ δάξας (ἴστω τοιοῦτο καὶ πορρωτικῆς δάξης ἴφισιν) ἔβρισεν τῆς φίλης ἡσυχίας, τῆς πατρὸς ἐκείνης καὶ ἁδελφῆς μετὰ τῶν πλεονίστων συνοδείας, τῆς ἀλόγου, καὶ ἀλόγου, καὶ ἀνιστοχλήτου συνεπιστολογίας.* The latter part vindicates his sudden promotion from the rank of a layman to the patriarchate, by the unanswerable examples of his predecessors Nestorius

and Tarasius, and that of St. Ambrose of Milan.

\* Nicolas neglected no means of carrying his point. He did not disdain female influence. Besides letters to the clergy of the East, and to the senate of Constantinople, he wrote to the mother and to the wife of the Emperor to maintain the cause of Ignatius, to reject the adulterer of the see, the usurper, the neophyte Photius.—Epist. Nicol. I.

after the promulgation of this decree, shall presume to disturb him in the exercise of his office, separate from his communion, or dare to judge him anew, without the consent of the Apostolic See, if a clerk, shall share the eternal punishment of the traitor Judas; if a layman he has incurred the malediction of Canaan: he is excommunicate, and will suffer the same fearful sentence from the eternal Judge."

Never had the power of the clergy or the supremacy of Rome been asserted so distinctly, so inflexibly. The privileges of Rome were eternal, immutable, anterior to, derived from no synod or council, but granted directly by God himself: they might be assailed, but not transferred; torn off for a time, but not plucked up by the roots. An appeal was open to Rome from all the world, from her authority lay no appeal.<sup>p</sup>

The Emperor and Constantinople paid no regard to these terrible anathemas of the Pope. As long as he possessed the favour of the Emperor, Photius remained in undisturbed possession of his see. An angry correspondence was kept up between the Emperor and the Pope. In the Emperor's letter he seems (for his letter is only known by the Pope's reply) to have addressed the Pope as a refractory and contumacious subject. He threatens Rome itself with fire and sword. Nicolas maintains his haughty independence,<sup>q</sup> treats these idle menaces with contempt. He significantly reminds the Emperor of the

<sup>p</sup> The Emperor, it appears, had demanded that his disloyal subject, the monk Theognetus, the messenger of Ignatius to Rome, should be delivered up. "Many thousands," replies the Pope, "come to Rome every year, and place themselves devoutly under the protection of St. Peter. We have the power of summoning monks, and even clergy, from every part of the world: you, O Emperor, have no such power; you have nothing to do with monks, but humbly to entreat their prayers." Never would he surrender to a worldly sovereign a monk, who by his profession declared his contempt for palaces, for all the honours, dignities, and gifts which kings could bestow.

<sup>q</sup> The Emperor (or was it the insolence of the Greek scholar, Photius?) had spoken of the Latin language as a barbarous Scythian jargon. The indignant Pope replies, that to censure that language is to censure its maker, God; that it was one of the languages inscribed on the Cross; that the Scythians are idolaters, and only use Latin to worship God; that some of the services even in the churches of Constantinople were in Latin. "Let the Emperor cease to call himself Emperor of the Romans, or abstain from insulting the Roman language." It is curious to see Latin on the defensive.

fate of Sennacherib; and tauntingly reproaches him with his dastardly submission to the Saracens. "We have not invaded Crete; we have not depopulated Sicily; we have not subdued the countless provinces of Greece; we have not burned the churches in the very suburbs of Constantinople; yet, while these pagans conquer, waste, burn with impunity, we Catholic Christians are menaced with the vain terrors of your arms. Ye release Barabbas, and put Christ to death." Nicolas concludes with evoking the whole cause to Rome, cites the two conflicting parties, Ignatius and Photius at least by his representative, as well as the other bishops personally, to submit themselves to his tribunal. On the faithful fulfilment of these terms, he will condescend to allow the Emperor to communicate with the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, with himself specially, and his brother priest, Ignatius. In conclusion, he ominously reminds him of the fate of the emperors, the persecutors of the Church, Nero, Dioclesian, Constantius, Anastasius; the glory of those who have been its faithful friends and servants. In another letter—the strife was now dragging on its fourth year—Nicolas enjoins the Emperor to burn the blasphemous and filthy letter with which he has dared to insult the Holy See; if he refuses, the Pope will himself summon an assembly of prelates, anathematise all who favour or maintain these documents, and cause the Emperor's missive publicly to be suspended over a slow fire in the sight of all the nations who reverence the throne of St. Peter, to his eternal disgrace.

At length Photius determined to keep no terms with his unrelenting adversary. The letters no doubt of the Emperor asserted, among other blasphemies, so called at Rome, the independence of the Byzantine See. He must now maintain that independence. All his submission, the tempting lure which he had offered, the total suppression of Iconoclasm, had been treated with scorn: he had found himself strangely mistaken in the man whom he had found in the papal chair; he might have supposed Nicolas, like one of his immediate predecessors, only the head of a faction in Rome, the timid vassal of

the Western emperor. Nicolas, as he knew, was involved in the strife with King Louis, on account of the repudiation of his wife.

Pope Nicolas was now the aggressor. Bardas, the protector of Photius, suspected or known to aspire to the Empire, had been cut to pieces.<sup>r</sup> Michael ruled alone, or rather had surrendered the rule to Basil the Macedonian, soon to supplant him in the Empire. A new legation arrived at Constantinople: it demanded that Photius and Ignatius should be sent to Rome for judgment. But Photius had changed with the times; his skilful flatteries had secured the protection of Michael, or he was too strong not to be protected. The fame, the accomplishments, the acknowledged eloquence,<sup>s</sup> even the virtues of Photius, had now obtained great influence with all orders.

In the year 867 he had summoned a council at Constantinople: the obsequious prelates listened to the arraignment, and joined in the counter excommunication, of Pope Nicolas. Photius drew up eight articles, inculcating in one the faith, in the rest the departure of the See of Rome from ancient and canonical discipline.<sup>t</sup> Among the dreadful acts of heresy and schism which were to divide for ever the Churches of the East and West were:—I. The observance of Saturday as a fast. II. The permission to eat milk or cheese during Lent. IV. The restriction of the chrism to the bishops. VI. The promotion of deacons at once to the episcopal dignity. VII. The consecration of a lamb, according to the hated Jewish usage. VIII. The shaving of their beards by the clergy. The fifth only of the articles objected by Photius, the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, was an error so awful as to deserve a thousand anathemas. The third, condemning the enforced celibacy of the clergy, was alone of high moral or religious importance. "From this usage we see, in the West," says

<sup>r</sup> A letter to Bardas likewise appears; it must, I think, be of earlier date: Nicolas can hardly have been ignorant of his fate six months before.

<sup>s</sup> The young, it is said, crowded in

rapture to the schools, where he still delivered his attractive lectures.

<sup>t</sup> These were mostly the points of difference which in his letter to Nicolas he had treated as of no importance.

Photius, "so many children who know not their fathers." These, however, were but the pretexts for division. The cause lay deeper, in the total denial of the papal supremacy by the Greeks; their unequivocal assertion that with the Empire that supremacy had passed to Constantinople."

The decree of the council boasted the signature of the Emperor (obtained, it was said, in an hour of drunkenness); of Basil the Macedonian, averred, most improbably to have been forged; of the three Eastern Patriarchs; the senate, the great officers; of abbots and bishops to the number of nearly one thousand.

But the episcopal messenger who was to bear to Rome this defiance of the Church of Constantinople, and the counter-excommunication of the pope, had proceeded but a short way on his journey when he was stopped by the orders of the new emperor. A revolution in the palace was a revolution in the Church of Constantinople. The Drunkard was an ill-omened name for the patron of a bishop—and the drunkenness of Michael aggravated rather than excused his profane diversions. It was said to be his common amusement to mimic with low and dissolute companions the holiest rites of the Church. This unworthy monarch was hurled from his throne; another Emperor ruled in the East. The first act of Basil the Macedonian was to depose Photius. Photius is said to <sup>Sept. 24, 867.</sup> have refused the communion to the murderer Basil. From this time a succession of changes agitated the Empire: Photius rose or fell at each successive change.\*

A hostile council was assembled; among these were ecclesiastics, appearing as representatives of the three <sup>Council of Constantinople.</sup> Patriarchates now under the Mohammedan sway, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> The legates of the Pope, Hadrian, who had already received the ambassadors of the

\* "Cum etiam glorientur et perhibeant quando de Romanæ urbe Imperatores Constantinopolin sunt translati, hinc et primatum Romanæ sedis ad Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam transmigrasse, et cum dignitatibus regiis etiam ecclesiæ Romanæ privilegia."—*Epist. lxx. Nicol. I. ad Hincmar. p. 472.*

<sup>7</sup> There is a very curious account in Nicetas of two books said to have been

found in the possession of Photius; one, illustrated with caricatures, of the life and acts of Ignatius; one, the account of the Council of Constantinople. They were produced and trampled under foot at Rome. One, it is said, was translated into Latin.

<sup>7</sup> The representatives of these sees at the Council of Photius are of course impostors; those at the present real and

Emperor, condemned Photius, and approved the restoration of Ignatius, were present. No one was permitted to take his seat till he had signed a formulary anathematising all heretics Iconoclasts and Photius, and also condemnatory of the late council. Those who had communicated with the usurper were received only after having done penance. Some contumacious prelates, who refused to prejudge the cause which they were assembled to consider, were ignominiously expelled from the council.\* All the ordinations of Photius were declared void. The crimes, the calumnies of Photius, who was dragged before the council by the emperor's guard, were rehearsed before his face. He stood mute: his degradation was at once determined; and so fierce was the resentment, that, not content with dipping their pens in the ink with which they were to sign his condemnation, they wrote it in the Sacramental wine, as it is plainly said in the blood of Christ.<sup>a</sup> The biographer of Ignatius bitterly deplores the lenity of the council; he does not explain what measures he wished them to adopt, but to their mistimed tenderness he ascribes all the evils of the second elevation of Photius. He interprets a terrible earthquake, which threw down many churches, and a furious tempest, as the remonstrances of Heaven against this weak leniency. Other signs, on the same authority, glorified the restoration of Ignatius. By a new kind of Transubstantiation, the consecrated bread glowed like a live coal from heaven, and the cross over the altar was agitated by a gentle motion.

Photius, in his exile, heard of this appalling earthquake. He rejoiced that he was relieved from beholding the sufferings of his people; he is strongly tempted even to suggest that it is a protest of Heaven against the injustice done to him by the council. That council, in his epistles, he treats as a violent, unjust, lawless synod; a synod of furious bacchanals, avowedly met not to judge, but to

authentic representatives. This is received as the eighth General Council by the Latin Church.

\* Yet Photius found some defenders; Euthimius, Bishop of Cæsarea, Zacharias of Chalcedon.

<sup>a</sup> ἀλλὰ τὸ φρικωδέστατον, ὡς καὶ εἶδον ἑπὶ τὴν διαβεβαιουμένην, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ ζωῆος τῷ αἵματι βάπτουσι τὸν κάλαμον. —Nicet. Vit. Ignat., p. 1231.

ratify his predetermined condemnation. For ten years Ignatius ruled in peace.<sup>b</sup> On his death there was a strange reaction in favour of his proscribed, banished, persecuted rival. Photius, it is said, from his monastic retreat, administered such skilful flattery to the Emperor, that by Basil's command he was reinstated in the See of Constantinople. So write his enemies. It is more likely that his transcendent learning and accomplishments,<sup>c</sup> a strong feeling that his crimes had been exaggerated by his implacable adversaries, some lurking jealousy that Constantinople had too completely subjected herself to Rome, may have led to his second rise. A new Council, at which were present two Papal legates, ratified the elevation of Photius. The Pope himself, John VIII. (Nicolas and his successor, Hadrian II., had disappeared from the scene), acquiesced in the decision.

A.D. 867-877.

A.D. 879.

The Pope acknowledged the usurper, the monster of wickedness, the persecutor, the heretic, him who had dared to assert the co-equality, the supremacy of Constantinople to Rome, as the legitimate Patriarch.<sup>d</sup>

Photius fell again at the death of his new patron.

Leo the Philosopher, the son of Basil, once more ignominiously expelled him from his throne. Yet, though accused of treason, Photius was acquitted, and withdrew into honoured retirement. He did not live to witness or profit by another revolution. Though the schism of thirty years, properly speaking, expired in his person, and again a kind of approximation to Rome took place, yet the links were broken which united the two Churches; the articles of difference, from which neither would depart, had been defined and hardened into rigid dogmas. During the dark times of the Papacy

A.D. 886.

<sup>b</sup> Even Ignatius had maintained against Rome his right to jurisdiction over the Bulgarians. He was in his turn threatened with canonical censures. —Hadrian, *Epist. ad Imperat.*, Labbe.

<sup>c</sup> Among the most bitter and pathetic lamentations of Photius in his exile is the being deprived of his books.

<sup>d</sup> Photius is accused of interpolating letters of Pope Leo, certainly much amplified in the Greek translations from

the Latin copies, as they now exist, and there are suspicious passages, highly adulatory of Photius, and one suppression (*Epist. 97*). There are others so much stronger in the Greek, that we cannot attribute them to so adroit a writer as Photius. Baronius supposes this *feminine* weakness of John VIII. to have given rise to the fable of Pope Joan! Was an act of peace and conciliation the monstrous and painful travail which revealed her sex?

which followed the disruption, even the intercourse became more and more precarious. The Popes of the next century were too busy in defending their territories or their lives to regard the affairs of the East; the darkness which gathered round both Churches shrouded them from each other's sight.

Nicolas the Great had not lived to triumph even in the first fall of Photius. In the West his success was more complete; he had the full enjoyment of conscious power exercised in a righteous cause. Not merely did he behold one of Charlemagne's successors prostrate at his feet, obliged to abandon to papal censure and to degradation even his high ecclesiastical partisans, but in succession the greatest prelates of the West, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, and even Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, who seemed to rule despotically over the Church and kingdom of France, were forced to bow before his vigorous supremacy.

John, Archbishop of Ravenna, is accused of immoderate ambition and avarice, of determined hostility, and a deep, deliberate design of emancipating his see from the domination of Rome. He had taken possession of certain estates claimed by the Roman see, deposed, excommunicated, imprisoned of his own authority all who made resistance, usurped in favour of St. Apollinaris, the tutelar saint of Ravenna, the privileges of St. Peter; treated the citations of the Pope to appear before his tribunal, or before a synod at Rome, to answer for certain heretical opinions charged against him, with the utmost contempt; though excommunicated by that synod, he persisted in the same disdainful contumacy.<sup>o</sup> He aspired, no doubt, to set up the jurisdiction of Ravenna, which he extended beyond its usual limits, as independent, if not superior to Rome. Unless as having been the imperial residence, the seat of empire, it is impossible to understand on what grounds the archbishop rested his haughty pretensions. Ecclesiastical must, according to his theory, have humbly followed the civil supremacy.

John, Archbishop of Ravenna.

A.D. 861.

\* "Missos illius spernebat, et gloriam beati Petri Apostoli, quantum in se erat, evacuabat."—Anastas. Vit. Nicol. I.

But John was a man of harsh and unpopular character. At first, indeed, he was successful in his appeal to the Emperor Lothair for his interposition; accompanied by two imperial officers he arrived at Rome. But Nicolas mildly rebuked the ambassadors of the Emperor for presuming to enter into such relations with an excommunicated person; they abandoned his defence; the archbishop, refusing to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, retired from Rome. But his own city did not espouse his cause.<sup>1</sup> At the invitation of the principal inhabitants the Pope visited Ravenna; he was received with the warmest welcome by the nobles, and with the acclamations of the people. John fled to Pavia again to implore the succour of the Emperor. As he passed along the streets the doors were closed, and the citizens shrank from the followers of the excommunicated prelate as from infected persons. From the Emperor himself he received this contemptuous message,—“Let him go and humble himself before that great Pope to whom we and the whole Church submit in obedience.” The proud prelate had no alternative but with tears to implore the mercy of his adversary: and Nicolas, having completed his humiliation by enforcing a public oath of allegiance, and of the most full and loyal obedience, on the most sacred relics, on the cross and sandals of Christ, and on the four Gospels, condescended to receive him into communion. The terms of his reconciliation Nov. 1, 862. were such as to ensure the complete submission of the See of Ravenna. The archbishop was to present himself, unless prevented by illness or unavoidable necessity, once a year at Rome; to consecrate no bishop but after his election by the Duke, the clergy, and the people, and on the sanction, by letter, of the apostolic see; to allow all his bishops free access for appeal to Rome; to surrender all contested property to which he could not establish his claim in the courts of law. So ended this opposition to the Papal supremacy in Italy.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Agnelli, *Vit. Pontific. Ravenn.* apud Muratori. John was accused of tyranny over his suffragan bishops. They were not allowed “limina Apostolorum adire.”

<sup>2</sup> “Ut nullus amodo et deinceps Archiepiscopus Ravennæ ad vestra Episcopii sine voluntate vestra accedere temptet vel aliquam pecuniam a vobis exigere . . . vel res ecclesiæ vestræ, aut

If power and wealth could have secured independence, the extraordinary rise of the sacerdotal order throughout the Transalpine Carlovingian Empire, more especially of the great metropolitan prelates in France and on the Rhine, during the decline of that dynasty, might have been formidable to the Roman supremacy, if asserted by a timid or a feeble Pontiff. It was not the Pope alone, but all the clergy, who were a permanent undying corporation, as compared with the temporal nobility. The hierarchy had risen, and were still rising, in proportion to the decay, and partly out of the ruins, of the great temporal feudatories. That military aristocracy was exhausting itself with unexampled rapidity; it disdained to recruit itself from the lower orders; and every family which became extinct weakened the power of the temporal nobles. The civil wars, the wars against the Normans, not now confined to the coasts, but ravaging the inland provinces (they had sacked Paris, Ghent, Hamburg, Cologne); the libertinism of manners, which crowded the halls of the nobles with spurious descendants, often without perpetuating the legitimate descent; devotion, which threw many who might have kept up the noblest families into the Church or the cloister; the alienation of their estates, through piety or superstition, to sacred uses;—all these causes conspired to drain away the riches and the power of the nobility.

But the perpetual Church was always ready to acquire, and forbidden to alienate, and was protected, even in these wild times, at least in comparative security, by awful maledictions against believers, by miracles

*monasteria vestra, sive prædia, per quodvis ingenium diripere audeat."* The metropolitan power of Ravenna was annulled. The estates of Ravenna in Sicily seem to have been seized and appropriated by Rome.—Agnelli, p. 103. Yet the ambition of the Archbishops of Ravenna was not extinguished by this discomfiture and spoliation. At the famous battle of Fontanet appeared George, Archbishop of Ravenna, with 300 horses loaded with treasures taken, to the indignation of the clergy, from the churches. George had been conse-

crated at Rome, but aspired to assert the independence of Ravenna. This wealth was to purchase the Emperor Lothair's favour at this critical juncture. But he chose the wrong side. He was taken, robbed of his treasures, stripped of all to a sorry nag, on which he was led before the conqueror, Charles the Bald. By Charles he was bitterly reproached for deserting his flock and appearing in the front of the battle. He was pardoned by the merciful intervention of the Empress Judith, and resumed his see.—Agnelli, p. 185.

which seemed constantly at their command, against heathens as well as Christians. Its immortal order rested on no precarious or hereditary descent. The cathedral or the monastery might be burned, as was sometimes the case in the Norman inroads, the clergy and the monks massacred. A new generation arose immediately among the ruins, resumed their wasted estates, and repaired their shattered buildings. The metropolitan or the bishop had always an heir at hand: the transmission of his sacred property, though sometimes diverted from its proper use by hierarchical prodigality, or by episcopal nepotism, descended on the whole in the right line. All these losses were more than recompensed by unchecked and unscrupulous acquisitions. The Church at times was plundered: all possessions were precarious during the long anarchy which followed the death of Louis the Pious, the persons of the priesthood were not secure. But still it renewed its strength, recovered its dilapidated resources; found some latent power which brought it back to its commanding superiority. It ever retrieved its losses, revenged itself for its humiliations, and still grew on under every, it might seem, fatal change in the political atmosphere.

France and part of Germany, but especially France, had become a kind of feudal theocracy. Ecclesiastical councils almost superseded the Diets of the nation.<sup>b</sup> Bishops and abbots, themselves nobly born, outnumbered the temporal nobles. The descendants of Charlemagne were surrounded by a tonsured, not an armed aristocracy; the greater part of the royal army was levied by the prelates of the Church. Even the royal family, ambitious of real power, were constantly intruding themselves into the more wealthy bishoprics or abbasies.

The superiority of the clergy even over the Crown was openly and distinctly asserted. Kings were not exempt from that general obedience enjoined by <sup>Power.</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Nithard says, on occasion of the alliance of Charles and Louis against Lothair, "Primum quidem visum est, ut rem ad Episcopos sacerdotesque quorum aderat pars maxima, conferret,

ut illorum consultu, *veluti numine divino*, harum rerum exordium atque auctoritas proderetur."—l. iv. c. i. These were purely secular matters, and this is the usual language. Compare c. iv.

the Apostle.<sup>1</sup> The clergy ruled the laity through their vices, but chiefly vices of one kind. They were the appointed, the heaven-delegated guardians of connubial morals; to them belonged all matrimonial causes; no one, not the highest in the realm, was exempt from their interference; and if their judgments had always been superior to unworthy influences, and if, in these lawless times, they had equally opposed, as some no doubt did, oppression, inhumanity, injustice, their rule might have mitigated far more the ferocious manners, and assisted in blending together the hostile orders and races. But instead of Christianising the world, themselves had become secularised; they were stern barons or haughty dukes, rather than peaceful prelates and humble teachers of the gospel. It might, indeed, seem that, at this time, the only important public affairs were the domestic relations of the Sovereign. That licence which Charlemagne indulged without check or remonstrance, was denied to his feebler descendants. Council after council met on questions of adultery, divorce, and incest. Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, had married successively Ethelwolf, King of England; Ethelbald, her step-son; a connection which shocked all feeling; and Baldwin, Count of Flanders; who had carried her off and married her with her own consent.<sup>m</sup> Here prudence somewhat checked the moral zeal of the Church. The Pope intercedes in favour of Baldwin, lest he should revolt to the Pagan Normans. Another council, that of Toul, was called to annul the marriage of Stephen, Count of Auvergne, with the daughter of Raimond, Count of Tholouse, because a relation of his wife's had been his mistress. The Pope himself took cognizance, in a council at Rome, of the divorce of Ingeltruda from her husband, Count Boso, by whom she had been abandoned.

Matrimonial  
causes.

<sup>1</sup> Hincmar (De Divortio Hl. et Theut.), who not only asserted but exercised also this power, quotes, as a sentence of Pope Gelasius, that the pontifical is higher than the royal power, because the clergy have to render an account even of kings to God. He cites the restoration of Louis the Pious as an

act of episcopal authority. "*Nostra ætate Hludovicum Augustum a regno dejectum, post satisfactionem, episcopalis unanimitas, saniore concilio, cum populi consensu, et ecclesiæ et regno restituit.*" —P. 473.

<sup>m</sup> Nicol. Pap. Epist. Carolo Calvo. 862, Nov. 23.

The matrimonial cause, however, which for many years distracted part of France, on which council after council met, and on which the great prelates of Lorraine came into direct collision with the Pope, and were reduced to complete and unpitied humiliation under his authority, was that of King Lothair and his Queen Theutberga.

This nobility, at once of race and order, which was the strength of the Carolingian hierarchy, of nobility by birth, and of power by ecclesiastical dignity, was that which was most likely to grow up into natural independence, to resist all foreign supremacy, and, unless met with an intrepid and firm assertion of delegated divine authority, to shake off all subordination. In the struggle with Pope Nicolas the Frank clergy espoused a bad cause, one in which the moral, as well as religious sympathies of mankind were against them. When, in the character of guardians of public and private virtue, they countenanced gross immorality, the abrogation of their unjust decrees by the Pope carried with it the general sentiment. The whole affair is a monstrous tissue of indecency, cruelty, and injustice. To know the times must be known this trial, which so long occupied the clergy of the West.

Lothair II., King of Lorraine, the second son of the Emperor Lothair, had married Theutberga, the daughter of Boso, the powerful Count of Burgundy. Soon after his marriage he had dismissed her, from disinclination or a former attachment, from his court. The popular feeling had compelled him to restore her to her conjugal honours; but he would not bear the yoke. Publicly before the officers and great vassals of his court, he accused her of incest with her brother, Hubert, Abbot of St. Maurice.<sup>a</sup> This revolting charge was made more loathsome by minute circumstances, contradictory and impossible.<sup>o</sup> Yet on this charge the obsequious nobility, with

King Lothair  
and Theut-  
berga.

A.D. 860.

<sup>a</sup> Compare throughout, if thought fit, the treatise of Hincmar, *De Divortio Hlotharii et Theutbergæ*. The questions submitted to the archbishop are only surpassed in their offensiveness by their absurdity. Hincmar discusses them with minute obscenity, protesting that he and his fellow bishops are entirely ignorant

of such matters, and only acquired their knowledge by reading.

<sup>o</sup> Not from the high character of the abbot, whose discipline at St. Maurice was of the loosest; he lived himself with dancing girls. His brother-in-law made him a duke.—*Epist. Benedict III.*, 857. He seems to have lived as a layman.

the consent of the clergy, put the unhappy queen upon her trial. She demanded the ordeal of hot water; <sup>p</sup> her champion passed through unhurt; and who should presume now to doubt her innocence? She was restored at least to her rank and to outward respect, but treated with such petty and harassing cruelty, that at length the weary woman made a public confession of her impossible crime. A synod of the clergy was convoked at Aix-la-Chapelle; it was attended by the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves; the Bishops of Metz, Tongres, Verdun, Melun, and Autun.

Their first decree not only released, but interdicted Lothair from all connection with his adulterous wife; the second enforced a public penance on the unhappy Theutberga.

But separation alone was not the object of Lothair. He had lived in open concubinage with Waldrada, it has been said, without sufficient proof, the sister of Gunther, Archbishop of Cologne, and niece of Theotgand, Archbishop of Treves.<sup>q</sup> A third council assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle. At this council, too, appeared the

A.D. 862.

Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, Adventius of Metz, Franko of Tongres, Atto of Verdun, Arnulf of Toul, the Bishops of Utrecht and Strasburg. The king pleaded pre-engagement to Waldrada, and declared that he only married the daughter of Boso because her father's alliance was absolutely necessary in the perilous state of the kingdom. The canon laws against incest were read, the

<sup>p</sup> In Hincmar there is a curious discussion on the ordeal. The archbishop draws a strange mystical analogy with the Deluge, in which the wicked were destroyed by water, the just saved: the fire in which Sodom was destroyed, Lot escaped. The ordeal was held to be a kind of baptism. The wiser Archbishop Agobard of Lyons wrote against the ordeal, as against some other superstitions of his time.

<sup>q</sup> Sismondi quotes as authority for this relationship the *Annales Metenses*, "according to which," he says, "Gunther and Theotgand were excommunicated and deposed on account of their relationship to Waldrada, and the assistance they gave her." In the *Ann. Met.* Gunther is bribed to the king's party

by a promise to marry his niece (neptis), and this niece cannot be Waldrada.—"Guntharii Episcopi neptis ad regem accersitur, ac semel, ut aiunt, ab eo stupratur, atque cum cachinno omnium et omnium derisione ad avunculum remittitur." This insult, moreover, to Gunther is utterly irreconcilable with his faithful adhesion to the cause of Lothair and Waldrada, and makes the affair more inexplicable.—*Ann. Met.* apud Bouquet, p. 191. The *Annales Bertiniani* say that the king was bound to Waldrada by witchcraft, as it was said "faventibus illi avunculo suo Luitprando et Vularia, qui ob hoc maxime illi erant familiares." Luitprand here seems to have been her uncle.—Apud Bouquet, p. 79.

confession of Theutberga recited,<sup>r</sup> the marriage declared void, and Waldrada proclaimed the lawful queen. She appeared in public in all the array and splendour of the king's wife.\*

It was at this juncture that the Pope interposed to protect the injured and blameless wife of Lothair. Theutberga herself, worn out with persecution, had renewed her confession, and only entreated permission to retire into a convent to bewail her sins. The first negotiations of the Pope were strangely baffled. His legates, one of them the same Radoaldus, Bishop of Porto, who had shown so much weakness or venality at Constantinople, was bribed by Lothair and the Lotharingian bishops. A third council at Metz, at which the Pope's legates were present, ratified all the decrees of the former synods. The legates, if they did not assent, made no opposition. With this decree the two Archbishops, Gunther and Theotgand, were so imprudent as to proceed in person as the king's ambassadors to Rome. They rushed blindly into the net; the net closed around them. Nicolas summoned a synod, and from that synod issued a lofty edict, addressed to Hincmar of Rheims and Wanilo of Rouen. The Pope condemned, in the strongest terms, the guilt of King Lothair—if king he might be called—and Gunther and Theotgand, as the abettors and accomplices in his guilt. He annulled the acts of the synod of Metz, which was hereafter to be called no synod, but a brothel of adulterers. He excommunicated and deposed Gunther and Theotgand, and all the bishops their partisans.

The pride of the high-born prelate, Gunther, broke out into fury at this unexpected affront. He hastened to the camp of the Emperor, Louis the Elder, brother of King Lothair, to whom, on the severance of the empire of Lothair I., had fallen the kingdom of Italy, with the Imperial title. The Emperor at once espoused the cause of the German

Pope Nicolas  
interferes.

Nov. A.D. 862.

Archbishops  
of Cologne  
and Treves  
at Rome.  
Oct. 863.

\* A new contradiction was now inserted into the confession of Theutberga, that she was not "idonea conjux."

<sup>r</sup> According to one letter of Pope Ni-

colas, she was actually married "publico festoque nuptiarum ritu celebrato, Waldradam sibi jure matrimonii sociavit."—Nicol. Pap. Epist., Bouquet, p. 434.

prelate, shared in his resentment, and marched with his army upon Rome.

The Pope attempted no resistance; he summoned his clergy around him; ordered a rigid fast and perpetual litanies to God, to avert the wrath of the Emperor. The lawless soldiery entered Rome; the Emperor's guards occupied the approaches to St. Peter's; and as the clergy and people came in solemn procession, with their crosses borne before them, and chanting their sad litanies, the crosses and banners were thrown down, trampled on, and broken; the clergy, maltreated, beaten, hardly escaped with their lives. Even the great crucifix, the offering, it was believed, of the Empress Helena, which contained a portion of the true cross, was broken to pieces, and dashed into the mire. Some pious Englishmen collected the fragments with reverential care. The Pope heard that measures were in agitation to seize his person. He hastily crossed the Tiber in a boat, found his way into the church of St. Peter, and passed two days and nights without food. Heaven, in the mean time, appeared to declare in favour of the defenceless Pontiff. The man who had broken the great cross suddenly fell dead. The Emperor was seized with a fever. In the agony of his terror he sent the empress to implore the mercy of the Pope. A female ambassador, under such circumstances, was not likely to be difficult as to the terms of reconciliation. Louis at once abandoned the cause of the bishops. Deserted by all, they retired in disgrace to France. There they still supposed themselves secure in their own powers, and in the support of King Lothair. Before they left Rome they published an appeal to all Christian bishops. They complained, in the language of defiance, of the insolent injustice of the Pope. He had decoyed them to Rome; he had closed the gates on them as on robbers, ignominiously arrested them,<sup>1</sup> condemned them without synod or canonical examination, without accuser, without witness,

<sup>1</sup> They describe their arrest: "Ibique observatis ostiis, conspiratione more latrociniali facta, et ex clericis et laicis turba collecta et permixta, nos opprimere inter

tantos violenter studuisti . . . tuo solius arbitrio ex tyrannico furore damnare nosmet voluisti."

without discussion, without proof, without their own confession, in the absence of other metropolitan or suffragan bishops, with no common consent, of his own will, in his tyrannical madness. "This Lord Nicolas, who <sup>Declaration of arch-bishops.</sup> calls himself Pope, accounts himself as one of the Apostles, and makes himself Emperor, has presumed, at the instigation of our enemies, to condemn us. He will find that we are determined to resist his insanity, and make him repent of his precipitancy." They cast back his anathema in disdain, and in their turn excommunicate the Pope,<sup>6</sup> and declare that, by his arrogant self-exaltation over the whole Church, he has sequestered himself from its communion.<sup>7</sup> They added further, that they asserted only the rights of their own order. Nicolas refused to receive this protest, upon which one of the archbishop's officers and some of his men forced their way into the church of St. Peter, beat down the guards, one of whom was killed, and laid the daring document upon the tomb believed to contain the body of St. Peter.

The archbishops retreated to their dioceses. Notwithstanding the Papal interdict, Gunther celebrated divine service in his cathedral at Cologne; the more timid Theotgand abstained from his ecclesiastical functions.

But Lothair was as dastardly as lustful. Other bishops got round him, and urged on his weak mind all the terrors of the Papal power.<sup>8</sup> He did not <sup>Lothair abandons them.</sup> scruple to sacrifice those prelates who, in compliance with his will, had hesitated at no injustice, and had dared to confront and to defy, to commit a kind of capital treason against the sacerdotal power. He deposed Gunther, and appointed his own son,<sup>9</sup> a youth only. Gunther was deserted on all sides; the simple and blameless Archbishop

<sup>6</sup> See this remarkable document in the *Annales Bertiniani*, A.D. 863.

<sup>7</sup> "Contenti totius ecclesiæ communione et paternâ societate, quam tu arroganter te superexultans despicias, teque ab eâ elationis tumore indignum faciens sequestras."

<sup>8</sup> This is the language of Nicolas to King Lothair: "Ita corporis tui cedere motibus consensisti, ut relaxatis voluptatibus habenis temet ipsum in lacum

miseriæ et in lutum fecis pro libitu dejecisti, ut qui positus fueras ad gubernationem populorum, effectus sis ruina multorum."—*Ad Lothair. Reg.*, Oct. 863.

<sup>9</sup> Hugo never obtained actual possession. Some time after the see was intrusted to the care of Hilduin, brother of Gunther, who dispensed the revenues, though the see was held to be vacant.—*Ann. Bertin.*, p. 92.

of Treves\* had bowed before the storm; the other bishops of the condemned synod of Metz hastened to make their peace with Rome; they gladly accepted the indulgence of the holy father. The Archbishop of Cologne was forbidden to approach the royal presence, avoided as a person excommunicate. He seized the treasure of his Church, and, armed with this, in all ages a powerful weapon, he hastened to Rome to unfold the iniquities of the king's proceedings against his wife.<sup>a</sup> But Lothair had anticipated his revenge. He sent a bishop with the humblest protestations of repentance and submission to the Apostolic See. The Abbot Hubert, in the mean time, had been killed by his own retainers. Theutberga, who had lived under the guardianship of her brother, took refuge in the dominions of Charles the Bald. The alarm of Lothair increased; he suspected his uncles, Charles and Louis, of a design to seize and share his kingdom, the Pope of connivance, if not of more than connivance, in their hostile plans.

Nicolas was not content with his triumph over the feeble Lothair, and the daring but indiscreet bishops who had espoused his cause. He aspired to dictate to the other more powerful Carolingian kings, to Charles and to Louis; and even Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, the most learned, political, and powerful ecclesiastic in France,<sup>b</sup> must bow before his authority. He sent his legate, Arsenius, into France with letters to the sovereigns so haughty and imperious as to shock even the submissive spirit of those times.<sup>c</sup> He rebukes them with the tone of a master, or rather openly declares that he speaks with the authority of God, from actual divine inspiration, when he reproaches them for presuming to prohibit the bishops of their realms from obeying the papal sum-

\* "Simplicissimus ac innocentissimus vir."—Annal. Bertin.

<sup>a</sup> "Falsa de more suo."—Ann. Bertin. p. 86.

<sup>b</sup> Sismondi states boldly that Hincmar was the sole ruler of France.

<sup>c</sup> Nicolaus Papa Arsenium . . . cum epistolis ad Hludovicum et Carolum fratres . . . non cum Apostolicâ mansuetudine, et solitâ honorabilitate sicut Episcopi Romani consueverant Reges in

suis epistolis honorare, sed cum malitiosâ interminatione."—Pagi (sub ann. 865) rebukes the author of the Ann. Bertin., even Hincmar himself, perhaps the author, whose sentiments at all events the book expresses, for this misrepresentation. He appeals to the more courteous letter to Charles. But the epistle to the two brothers fully bears out the charge. April 22, 865.

mons to a synod at Rome.<sup>d</sup> He will not admit the excuse of Charles the Bald that the greater part of the bishops were watching day and night against the descents of the Norman pirates. He reproves this secular occupation of the bishops. If towards these kings he preserves some show of respect, of Lothair he speaks with unmitigated contempt. His uncles had urged Lothair to go on a suppliant pilgrimage to Rome; Lothair had expressed his earnest desire to do so. The Pope sternly interdicts his journey, declaring that the holy Roman Church would not receive, but despise and reject, such men.<sup>e</sup> He commands the king, without subterfuge or evasion, to receive back his wife; even if Theutberga should prefer the state of separation, she is to be compelled to return to her husband's bed. "But if Lothair, whom, to prevent war and bloodshed, we have still treated with some leniency, shall lift up his horn, and disobey your admonitions and ours, the affair must take its course."

The letter of the Pope to the bishops advances still higher pretensions; the object, indeed, is noble and Christian. He commands them to maintain that peace which had been sworn by the three royal brethren, to prevent the shedding of Christian blood. But he asserts the coronation of the Emperor to be a grant of the Imperial power by the Roman See. The sword was given to the Emperor by the Vicar of St. Peter, yet to be employed against infidels, not against his fellow Christians. The empire descended to Louis by hereditary right, but was confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See.<sup>f</sup>

The Legate "from the side" of the Pope began now to appear as a Dictator to the Northern kings. <sup>Papal legates.</sup> Arsenius was not the first who bore this title; but he asserted its pride and power with yet almost unprecedented vigour. The legate first appeared at Frankfort, and delivered his message to the Emperor Louis; thence

<sup>d</sup> "Unde si vos fortasse aliter dicitis, nos illud dicimus, quod divinitus revelatur." He thus claims divine authority for Roman synods: "Nos consensu illorum, revelante Domino, quæ decernenda sunt decerneremus."

<sup>e</sup> "Cui interdiximus, et omnino interdiximus, ut iter talis qualis nunc est non arripiat, eo quod sancta Ec-

clesia Romana tales respuat et contemnat."

<sup>f</sup> "Macheræ usum, quam primum a Petri principis Apostolorum vicario, contra infideles accepit, non cogatur in Christi fideles convertere. . . Regna sibi per hæreditarium jus devoluta, et sedis Apostolicæ auctoritate firmata."—Epist. ad Episcop. Gall. apud Bouquet, p. 404.

he passed to the court of Lothair.<sup>a</sup> He threatened the king with immediate excommunication if he did not dismiss the concubine Waldrada, and receive his repudiated queen. He then betook himself to Attigny, the residence of Charles the Bald. He peremptorily commanded the restoration of the Bishop Rothrad, who had been canonically, as it was asserted, deposed by Hincmar his metropolitan, and was now irregularly, without inquiry or examination, replaced by the arbitrary mandate of the Pope.<sup>b</sup> Hincmar murmured and obeyed; the king acquiesced in the papal decree, trembling at the menaced anathema.

A.D. 865.

From Attigny, Arsenius conducted Theutberga to the court of her husband. A solemn oath was dictated by the legate, and sworn on the Gospels by six counts and six vassals, in the name of Lothair, that he would receive Theutberga as his lawful wife, and restore her fully to her conjugal rights.

A.D. 865.

Four archbishops and four bishops, besides the legate, were present at the ceremony. She was then publicly delivered to her husband, under the most awful denunciations of excommunication and condemnation to everlasting fire,<sup>c</sup> if he did not fulfil the solemn compact. Lothair and Theutberga were then crowned King and Queen of Lorraine.

Arsenius found the papal fulminations weapons too useful and effective to be confined to royal offenders. A terrible excommunication of unusual violence was launched against certain plunderers who, some years before, had robbed him of a large sum of money, unless they made immediate restitution. Another was issued against Ingeltruda, the wife of Count Boso, who had left her husband, and was leading a wandering and disreputable life.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Apud Gandulfi villam."—Ann. Bertin.

<sup>b</sup> The Annales Bertin. are supposed to express the sentiments of Hincmar. "Et Rothradum canonicè a quinquè provinciarum episcopis dejectum, et a Nicolao papà non regulariter, sed potentialiter restitutum."—P. 89.

<sup>c</sup> "Si in omnibus, ut superius legitur, non observaverit atque impleverit, non

solum in presente vitâ sed etiam in æterno Dei terribili iudicio, eum B. Petro principi Apostolorum redditurum rationem et ab ipso æternaliter in eodem iudicio dammandum, et igni perpetuo concremandum."—Ann. Bertin. p. 90.

<sup>d</sup> The Ann. Bertin. mention this: "Epistolam Nicolai Papæ plenam terribilibus et a modestiâ sedis Apostolicæ hactenus inauditis maledictionibus."

Waldrada had been delivered up to Arsenius to be conducted to Rome, that she might undergo the proper penance; but Arsenius was persuaded by some powerful influence, not impossibly by bribery (for he was a man of notorious rapacity), to allow her, after she had reached Parma, to return to France.<sup>m</sup> Two years afterwards the two excommunicated archbishops, beguiled with false hopes of restoration, were persuaded to go to Rome; though on a former journey they had been sternly repelled by the Pope. The aged Archbishop of Treves died there; Gunther of Cologne hardly escaped with his life. Nicolas persisted to the end in his resistance to the intercession of the emperor Louis, and of many German bishops. He treated these men as open favourers of adultery; as the authors and contrivers of all this foul and revolting iniquity.<sup>n</sup> The inexorable Pope saw one die, the other on the brink of the grave, without relaxing his unforgiving severity.

Rumours soon reached the vigilant Pontiff that the reconciliation of Lothair with his wife was but false and seeming. He was suspected of continuing secret intercourse with Waldrada; although Adventius, the Bishop of Metz, protested that all the king's conversation with Waldrada (Waldrada, now under public sentence of excommunication)<sup>o</sup> was pure,<sup>p</sup> and that he treated his wife with the utmost respect, that he appeared with her in church, and was reported to admit her to his bed.<sup>q</sup> But this was soon belied by an earnest supplication to the Pope from the unhappy queen to be released from her miserable marriage. She asserted the previous wedlock of Lothair with Waldrada, her own unfitness, from some secret malady, for the conjugal state. She entreated to be permitted to come to Rome, that she

<sup>m</sup> Nicolas wrote to the bishops to treat Waldrada as an excommunicated person, for her contumacy in refusing to go to Rome, and her suspicious intrigues against the queen.—Epist. xxviii., Bouquet, 419.

<sup>n</sup> Compare his later letters, where he speaks of the "fœtida gesta." His usual name for Waldrada is *macha*.

<sup>o</sup> Waldrada was excommunicated Feb. 2, 866.

<sup>p</sup> Thus writes Adventius: "Et nos veriore experientiâ investigare volumus,

in nullo prorsus colloquio per tactum, vel visum illâ (Waldradâ) fieri voluit."

<sup>q</sup> "Theutbergam Reginam noster Senior ad præsens ita tractare cernitur, sicut rex conjunctam sibi debet tractare reginam, videlicet ad divinum officium pariter honorificè comitantem, et in mensâ regiâ simul convivantem, atque, ut relatio innuit, conjugalibus habitibus debitum solvere hilariter præterdit."—Apud Bouquet, p. 595.

might communicate with the Pope. Nicolas replied in a tone of stern commiseration. He refused to receive a confession extorted manifestly by force. Even were she to die, the Church would never permit Lothair to marry the adulteress Waldrada. The guilty king, by the example of his adultery, had plunged thousands into the chaos of perdition; what wonder if he should force others to commit perjury? He positively forbade her journey to Rome, and exhorted her to endure glorious martyrdom in the

cause of righteousness. The wretched Theutberga

was, in the mean time, exposed to every insult and contumely. Lothair had at one time accused her of adultery, and proposed that she should vindicate her honour by

wager of battle. Nicolas prohibited this appeal to

arms; and in a letter to Lothair himself, contempt, most profound and well deserved, mingles with his indignant expostulations. Lothair was at length driven, by the steadfast severity of the Pope, from every subterfuge.

He was preparing to send his wife to Rome, to appear himself before the judgment-seat, and even to yield up his beloved Waldrada to the penitential discipline of the Church. Before his descent into Italy he endeavoured, by the intercession of his uncle, the Emperor Louis, to obtain for his son by Waldrada the promise of Alsace. For this end

he still lingered in France; but Nicolas did not live to enjoy his perfect triumph; he died in November, A.D. 867—a Pontiff who, if he advanced no absolutely unexampled pretensions to supremacy in behalf of the Roman See, yet, by the favourable juncture and auspicious circumstances which he seized to assert and maintain that authority, did more than all his predecessors to

strengthen and confirm it. During all his conflicts in the West with the royal and with the episcopal power, the moral and religious sympathies of mankind could not but be on his side. If his language was occasionally more violent, even contemptuous, than became the moderation which, up to this time, had mitigated the papal decrees, he might plead lofty and righteous indignation: if he interfered with domestic relations, it was in defence of the innocent and defenceless, and in vindication

Death of  
Nicolas I.  
Nov. A.D. 867.

His character.

of the sanctity of marriage : if he treated kings with scorn, it was because they had become contemptible for their weakness or their vices : if he interfered with episcopal or metropolitan jurisdiction, the inferior clergy, even bishops, would be pleased to have a remote and possibly disinterested tribunal, to which they might appeal from prelates, chosen only from aristocratic connections, barbarians in occupation and in ferocity :<sup>\*</sup> if he was inexorable to transgressors, it was to those of the highest order, prelates who had lent themselves to injustice and iniquity, and had defied his power : if he annulled councils, those councils had already been condemned for their injustice, had deserved the reproachful appellation with which they were branded by the Pope, with all who had any innate or unpervverted sentiment of justice and purity. Hence the presumptuous usurpation even of divine power, so long as it was thus beneficently used, awed, confounded all, and offended few ; men took no alarm at the arrogance which befriended them against the oppressor and the tyrant.

The impression left by Nicolas I. on his times may be estimated by the words of a later writer. "Since the days of Gregory I. to our time sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicolas. He tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign : to holy bishops and clergy he was mild and gentle ; to the wicked and unconverted a terror ; so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him."<sup>a</sup>

But this vast moral advancement of the popedom was not all which the Roman See owes to Nicolas I. ; she owes the questionable boon of the recognition of the False Decretals as the law of the Church.

Nicolas I. not only saw during his pontificate the famous False Decretals take their place in the jurisprudence of Latin Christendom ; if he did not promulgate, he assumed them as authentic documents ; he gave them the weight of the papal sanction ; and with their aid prostrated at his feet the one great Transalpine prelate who could still maintain the independence of the Teutonic Church, Hincmar Archbishop of Rheims.

<sup>\*</sup> Giraud, *Droit Romain en France* pendant le Moyen Age, vol. i.

<sup>a</sup> Regin. Chron. ad ann 698. Pertz, i. 579.

Up to this period the Decretals, the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome, according to the authorised or common collection of Dionysius, commenced with Pope Siricius, towards the close of the fourth century. To the collection of Dionysius was added that of the authentic councils, which bore the name of Isidore of Seville. On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently over-awing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest popes from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the councils from Silvester to Gregory II., thirty-nine false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic councils.<sup>1</sup> In this vast manual of sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world. The False Decretals do not merely

Contents.

assert the supremacy of the Popes—the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome—they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity, and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross, the discovery of the relics of

<sup>1</sup> Nicolas of Cusa, and Turrecremata, before the Reformation, had doubted, as far as they dared to doubt. The Magdeburg centuriators, after them Blondel exposed the fraud with unanswerable arguments. The Jesuit La Torre attempted a feeble defence: he was scourged into obscurity by Blondel. Since that time there has been hardly a murmur of defence. There is an excellent brief (Roman Catholic) summary of the whole question in Walter (Kirchen Recht, pp. 155 et seq.). Mohler (Schriften) softens the fiction into poetry; he is too ingenious to be convincing; and wishes to convince, rather than succeeds, as it appears to me, in convincing himself. I know only from other writers what seems the masterly investigation of Knust. Gfrörer,

in his History of the Church and a dissertation (Freiburg, 1848), displays more than his usual industry and sagacity, but I think is somewhat too narrow and partial (compare Walter, Kirchen Recht, 158) in his hypothesis, that the sole, if not the sole, almost exclusive design of the Decretals was to lower the power of the metropolitans. Indeed, in his later and very valuable work, Die Karolinger (Freiburg, 1848), he seems to me to have taken a wider range, to have summed up the whole question with more perfect mastery. Gfrörer's general failing, in my judgment, is drawing wide and peremptory conclusions from scanty and doubtful evidence: he is too much enamoured of his own very great ingenuity.

the Apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The whole is composed with an air of profound piety and reverence; a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandisement of the See of Rome and the aggrandisement of the whole clergy in subordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable;—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favour; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day, and throughout the later history of Christianity.

The author or authors of this most audacious and elaborate of pious frauds is unknown; the date and place of its compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The False Decretals came not from Rome;<sup>Authorship.</sup> the time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain. In one year Nicolas I. is apparently ignorant of their existence, the next he speaks of them with full knowledge. They contain words manifestly used at the Council of Paris, A.D. 829, consequently are of later date; they were known to the Levite Benedict of Mentz,<sup>\*</sup> who composed a supplement to the collection of capitularies by Adgesil, between A.D. 840-847. The city

<sup>\*</sup> Eichhorn, almost alone, maintains their Roman origin. — Compare also Luden. Geschichte, v. p. 468, *et seqq.*

<sup>\*</sup> Walter appears to think Benedict the author of the work.

of Mentz is designated with nearly equal certainty as the place in which, if not actually composed, they were first promulgated as the canon law of Christendom.

The state of affairs in the divided and distracted empire might seem almost to call for, almost to justify, this desperate effort to strengthen the ecclesiastical power. All the lower clergy, including some of the bishops, were groaning, just at this time, under heavy oppression. By the constitution of Charlemagne, which survived under Louis the Pious, and, so long as the empire maintained its unity, asserted the independence of the Transalpine hierarchy of all but the temporal sovereign, the clergy were under strict subordination to the bishop, the bishop to the metropolitan, the metropolitan only to the Emperor. Conflicting Popes, or Popes in conflict with Italian enemies, or with their own subjects, had reduced the papacy to vassalage under the empire; conflicting kings, on the division of the realm of Charlemagne, had not yet, but were soon about to submit the empire to the Roman supremacy. All at present was anarchy. The Germans and the French were drawing asunder into separate rival nations; the sons of Louis were waging an endless, implacable strife; almost every year, less than every decad of years, beheld a new partition of the empire; kingdoms rose and fell, took new boundaries, acknowledged new sovereigns; no government was strong enough to maintain the law; might was the only law.<sup>†</sup>

The hierarchy, if not the whole clergy, had taken the lead in the disruption of the unity of the empire; they had abased the throne of Louis; they were for a short disastrous period now the victims of that abasement. Their wealth was their danger. They had become secular princes, they had become nobles, they had become vast landed proprietors; but during the civil wars it was not the persuasive voice, but the strong arm, which had authority; the mitre must bow before the helmet, the crosier before the sword: not only the domains, the persons of the clergy

<sup>†</sup> This is in no way inconsistent with the immense and steady advance of the clergy in power and wealth; it was a temporary depression, remedied, as will soon appear, from other sources of vigour and energy.

had lost their sanctity. The persecution and oppression of the Church and the clergy had reached a height unknown in former times. Thus writes Bishop Agobard of Lyons:—"No condition of men, whether free or unfree, is so insecure in the possession of his property as the priest; no one can foresee how many days he may be master of his church, of his house. Not only the estates of the Church, the churches themselves are sold." The Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 836) protested against the contempt into which the clergy had fallen with the ungodly laity. They wrote in bitter remonstrance to King Pepin, the son of Louis,—“There are people who boldly say, ‘Where hath God ordained that the goods of which the priests claim possession are consecrated to him? The whole earth is the Lord’s; has he not created it for the good of all mankind?’”<sup>a</sup> The metropolitans alone (we have seen those of the Rhine haughty to all beneath them, basely subservient to the wickedness of their kings) stood above the tumult, themselves if not tyrants or instruments of royal tyranny, either trampling on the inferior clergy, or, at least, not protecting them from being trampled on or plundered by others.

It might occur to the most religious, that for the sake of religion; it might occur to those to whom the dignity and interest of the sacerdotal order were their religion, that some effort must be made to reinvest the clergy in their imperilled sanctity. There must be some appeal against this secular, this ecclesiastical tyranny: and whither should appeal be? It could not be to the Scriptures, to the Gospel; it must be to ancient and venerable tradition, to the unrepealed, irrevocable law of the Church; to remote and awful Rome. Rome must be proclaimed in an unusual, more emphatic manner, the eternal, immemorial court of appeal; the tradition must not rest on the comparatively recent names of Leo the Great, of Innocent the Great, of Siricius, or the right of appeal depend on the decree of the Council of Sardica; it must come down from the successors of St. Peter himself in unbroken succession; the whole clergy must have a perpetual, infeasible sanctity of the same antiquity.

<sup>a</sup> Mansi sub ann. 836.

So may the idea of this, to us it seems, monstrous fiction have dawned upon its author; himself may have implicitly believed that he asserted no prerogative for Rome which Rome herself had not claimed, which he did not think to be her right. It is even now asserted, perhaps can hardly be disproved, that the False Decretals advanced no pretensions in favour of the See of Rome which had not been heard before in some vague and indefinite, but not therefore less significant, language. The boldness of the act was in the new authority in which it arrayed these pretensions. The author may have thought that in renewing the power, while he by no means lost sight of the holiness of the clergy, he was embarked in a hallowed cause. In some respects he shows skill at least as consummate as might be expected in that age. There was no great fear of detection in a fiction so advantageous to those who could alone expose it, the clergy, in an age which, for instance, received the life of St. Denys, written by the Abbot Hilduin of that monastery, and the ecclesiastical counsellor of the emperor, as identified with Dionysius the Areopagite; a legend almost of unparalleled extravagance, but which became at once accredited hagiology. The new code was enshrined, as it were, in a framework of deeply religious thought and language; it was introduced under the venerated name of Isidore of Seville (it was rumoured to have been brought from Spain by Riculf, Archbishop of Mentz); it was thus attached to the authentic work of Isidore, which had long enjoyed undisputed authority. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, as the most powerful, so, perhaps, the most learned Transalpine ecclesiastic, who might at once have exposed the fiction, which he could hardly but know to be a fiction, co-operated more than any one else to establish its authority. So long as he supposed it to advance or confirm his own power, he suppressed all intrusive doubts; he discovered too late that it was a trap (a mousetrap is his own undignified word) to catch unwary metropolitans.\* Hincmar was caught, beyond all hope of escape. In the appeal of Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, against Hincmar, metropolitan of Rheims, Pope Nicolas I. at first alleges no word of the new Decretals in favour of his right of

\* "Circumposita omnibus metropolitanis muscipula."—Opp. ii. 413.

appeal; he seemingly knows no older authority than that of Innocent, Leo, Siricius, and the Council of Sardica.<sup>a</sup> The next year not merely is he fully master of the pseudo-Isidorian documents, but he taunts Hincmar with now calling in question, when it makes against him, authority which he was ready to acknowledge in confirmation of his own power. Hincmar is forced to the humiliation of submission. Rothrad, deposed by Hincmar, deposed by the Council of Senils, is reinstated in his see.<sup>b</sup>

This immediate, if somewhat cautious, adoption of the fiction, unquestionably not the forgery, by Pope <sup>Adoption at Rome.</sup> Nicolas, appears to me less capable of charitable palliation than the original invention. It was, in truth, a strong temptation; but in Rome, where such documents had never been heard of, it is difficult to imagine by what arguments a man, not unlearned, could convince himself, or believe that he could convince himself, of their authenticity. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, of which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent: yet is there no holy indignation at fraud, no lofty reproof of those who dared to seat themselves in the pontifical chair and speak in the names of Pope after Pope. There is a deliberate, artful vindication of their authority. Reasons are alleged from which it is impossible to suppose that Nicolas himself believed their validity, on account of their acknowledged absence from the Roman archives. Nor did the successors of Nicolas betray any greater scruple in strengthening themselves by this welcome, and therefore only, unsuspecting aid. It is impossible to deny that, at least by citing without reserve or hesitation, the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud.<sup>c</sup>

Nor must be overlooked, perhaps the more important result of the acceptance of the pseudo-Isidorian statutes as the universal, immemorial, irrevocable law of Christen-

<sup>a</sup> Compare back p. 370.

<sup>b</sup> This fact appears to me irresistibly proved by Gfrörer in his dissertation. See also Die Karolinger, i. p. 479 et seq. Gfrörer seems to infer that they were

carried to Rome from beyond the Alps by Rothrad of Soissons.

<sup>c</sup> Nicolai Epist. ad Episcopos Gallie, Mansi, xv. 693.

dom. It established the great principle which Nicolas I. had before announced, of the sole legislative power of the Pope.<sup>d</sup> Every one of these papal epistles was a canon of the Church ; every future bull therefore rested on the same irrefragable authority, commanded the same implicit obedience. The Papacy became a legislative as well as an administrative authority. Infallibility was the next inevitable step, if infallibility was not already in the power asserted to have been bestowed by the Lord on St. Peter, by St. Peter handed down in unbroken descent, and in a plenitude which could not be restricted or limited, to the latest of his successors.

---

<sup>d</sup> Nicolai I. Epist. ad Michaellem Imperatorem, apud Labbe, sub ann. 865.

## CHAPTER V.

## HADRIAN II. HINC MAR OF RHEIMS.

NICOLAS was succeeded by Hadrian II., a rigid and lofty churchman, who, though his policy at first appeared doubtful,<sup>a</sup> resolutely maintained, but not with equal judgment and success, the principles of his predecessor. Hadrian (he was now seventy-five years old) had been married before he became a priest; his wife was still living; and a tragic event, in which the son of another Prelate, Arsenius, the late legate in France, was involved, might suggest to the popular mind that the more absolutely the higher clergy were secluded from all domestic ties the better.

Though the daughter of Hadrian was betrothed to another, she was carried off and married by Eleutherius, the son of Arsenius. Arsenius, implicated no doubt in the affair, fled with all his treasures to the court of the Emperor Louis. These treasures he placed in the hands of the Empress Ingeltruda, probably to secure the imperial protection for his son. He died suddenly, and so great was the hatred against him, that he was said to have been carried off while conversing freely with devils;<sup>b</sup> at all events, he died without the sacrament, and of his eternal damnation no one had any doubt. Hadrian sent a mission to the Emperor to demand that Eleutherius should be judged by the Roman law for the abduction of his daughter. Eleutherius in revenge, or despairing of the issue, murdered both his wife and her mother, the wife of the Pope.<sup>c</sup> By the Emperor's command he suffered the penalty of his crimes.

Hadrian II.  
Nov. 867.

Death of  
Arsenius the  
legate.

Oct. 12,  
A.D. 868.

<sup>a</sup> Vit. Hadriani, c. 15.

<sup>b</sup> "Ut dicebatur, cum dæmonibus confabulans, sine communione abiit in suum locum."—Ann. Bertin. p. 99.

<sup>c</sup> Hincmari Ann. "Stephaniam uxorem ipsius pontificis et ejus filiam, quam sibi rapuit, interfecit." Anas-

tasius the Librarian (not the biographer of the popes), the brother of Arsenius, was concerned, as was supposed, in this horrible business. The excommunication, already issued against him, was confirmed and repeated by Hadrian.

Hadrian, whether softened by these domestic calamities, appeared at first to take a milder course than Pope Nicolas in the affair of Lothair. He sent back, indeed, Theutberga, who had arrived at Rome to implore the dissolution of the marriage on the plea of her own personal infirmity : but, at the intercession of the Emperor Louis, he took off the ban of excommunication from Waldrada, and restored her to the communion of the Church.

By this lenity he might seem to lure King Lothair to the last act of submission. The King of Lorraine arrived in Italy ; the Pope seemed to yield to the influence of Louis and the Empress Ingelberga ; at least he accepted the munificent presents of the king.

From Monte Casino, where they first met, Lothair followed the Pope to Rome. There, instead of being received as a king, and as one reconciled with the See of Rome, when he entered the church all was silent and vacant ; not one of the clergy appeared : he retired to a neighbouring chamber, which was not even swept for his reception. The next day was Sunday, and he hoped to hear the mass chanted before him. The Pope refused him this honour. He dined, however, the next day with the Pope, and an interchange of presents took place.<sup>d</sup>

At length Hadrian consented to admit him to the communion. Towards the close of the holy office, holding the body and blood of Christ in his hands, the Pope thus addressed the king : " If thou avouchest thyself innocent of the crime of adultery, for which thou hast been excommunicated by the Lord Nicolas, and art resolved never again to have unlawful intercourse with the harlot Waldrada, draw near in faith, and receive this sacrament for the remission of thy sins. But if thou thinkest in thy heart to return to wallow in adultery, beware of receiving it, lest thou provoke the terrible judgment of God." The king shuddered, but did not draw back. Under a like adjuration, that they were not consentient to the guilt of

<sup>d</sup> The Ann. Bertin. and Ann. Met. do not quite agree in the arrangement of these events. The former at Monte Casino. sub ann. 869. This scene is placed by

the king with Waldrada, he administered the rite to the attendants on Lothair. Even Gunther, the contumacious Archbishop of Cologne, having drained to the dregs the cup of humiliation, was admitted to lay communion.\*

What was the terror of Western Christendom when it became known that every one of these men had perished before the end of the year! A pestilence, so common among northern armies in Italy, especially at Rome, broke out; but a few, and those only, it is said, who had avoided that fatal communion, survived. Lothair himself was seized with the fever at Lucca, with difficulty reached Placentia, and there expired.

Aug. 8.

Pope Hadrian seized the occasion of the contest for the kingdom of Lothair to advance still more daring and unprecedented pretensions. But the world was not yet ripe for this broad and naked assertion of secular power by the Pope, his claim to interfere in the disposal of kingdoms. Directly he left the strong ground of moral and religious authority, from which his predecessor Nicolas had commanded the world, he encountered insurmountable resistance. With all that remained of just and generous sympathy on their side Popes might intermeddle in the domestic relations of kings; they were not permitted as yet to touch the question of royal succession or inheritance. The royal and the episcopal power had quailed before Nicolas; the fulminations of Hadrian were treated with contempt or indifference: and Hincmar of Rheims in this quarrel with Hadrian regained that independence and ascendancy which had been obscured by his temporary submission to Nicolas.

Hadrian interferes in the disposal of Lothair's kingdom.

Charles the Bald his uncle, the son of Louis the Pious and the Empress Judith, seized at once the vacant dominions of Lothair, though the undoubted inheritance of the Emperor Louis II., as brother to the childless deceased sovereign. Charles was crowned at Metz; he rested his claim on the election of the people, and on his coronation by the bishops of the realm.† The

It is seized by Charles the Bald. June 28, 870.

\* This is the most probable time for the reconciliation of Gunther.

† Hadriani Epist. ad Ludovic. German. apud Bouquet, p. 442.

friendship of Louis the Emperor and King of Italy, then engaged in a successful war against the Saracens of Bari, was of greater importance to the Pope than that of Charles, now gathering almost the whole of the Transalpine empire under his sway. He espoused the claims of Louis with headlong ardour. The Emperor, he wrote significantly to his elder uncle Louis the Germanic, was warring, not like some other kings, against Christians, but against the sons of Belial, the enemies of the Christian faith; and he warned Louis against aggression on dominions which were not his own. "The hand of the Apostolic See will be strong on the side of this most pious Emperor; and the great Dispenser of battles, through the intercession of the chief of the apostles, will ensure triumph."<sup>a</sup>

In a letter to the nobles of the kingdom of Lorraine, he threatened with excommunication all who, disregarding the mandates of the Apostolic See, should oppose the claims of his ally the Emperor. To the nobles of Charles's kingdom he declared, that any one who should assist in his diabolic usurpation, would fall under anathema, and be given up to the companionship of the devil. He summoned the bishops, on their allegiance to the Apostolic See, to dissuade Charles from his ambitious designs. By concurring in such detestable deeds they were preparing him for hell.<sup>b</sup> To Charles himself he wrote two letters; one before the invasion, reprehending him for refusing to receive the papal legates; the second after it, threatening him with interdict, and accusing him of perjury for violating, as he said, the treaty of Verdun.

Hincmar had been specially summoned to break off all communion with the king, if he did not abandon the cause of Charles. Hincmar's answer shows that the doctrine of Wala, as to the inviolability of ecclesiastical fiefs, was not respected by such kings: "Should I do so, I should soon have to chant by myself in my choir, stripped of all my possessions and vassals."<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See the account of this campaign, and one for the imprisonment of the Emperor by the Duke of Benevento, in Erchempert, c. 34, 35; Pertz, iii. 252.

<sup>b</sup> "Et illi tam detestabilia faciendo . . . gehennam paratis."—Hadrian. ad Episcop. Gall. *ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> "Quoniam, si ex sententiâ vestrâ

June 28, 870.  
Hadrian re-  
sists in vain.

But the king, the nobles, and the bishops pursued their course—the king of ambition, the rest of obsequious obedience—without regarding the denunciations of Hadrian. Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, threw his preponderating weight into the scale in favour of the independence and consolidation of France and its absolute severance from the kingdom of Italy, which now seemed associated with the Empire. He wrote a grave, solemn, and argumentative remonstrance to the Pope. He refused Answer of Hincmar to the Pope. to withdraw, as commanded by Hadrian, from the court of Charles. He embodied in his own language that of Charles and his partisans.<sup>k</sup> “You,” said the King and nobles to the bishops, “contribute your prayers only against the Normans and other invaders; if you would have the support of our army as we of your prayers, demand of the Apostolic father, that, as he cannot be both king and bishop, and as his predecessors ruled the Church, which is their own, not the state, which is the king’s, he impose not on us a distant king, who cannot defend us against the sudden and frequent attacks of the pagans, nor command us Franks to be slaves. His ancestors laid not their yoke on our ancestors, nor will we bear it, for it is written in the Scriptures, that we should fight for our liberty and our inheritance to the death.”<sup>m</sup> The only enemy or rival whom Charles feared was his brother, Louis the Germanic; but a share in the spoil averted his enmity. Notwithstanding the interdict of the Pope, and the claims of the Emperor, the Kings of France and Germany quietly divided the dominions of their nephew. This strife was hardly over when Hadrian interposed in another affair, relating to the family of Charles the Bald; in revenge, it might be, for the contempt of his former mandates. Now he asserted his supremacy even over parental authority, though recognised and confirmed by the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the realm. It is a lawless and cruel history, showing at once the barbarous state of the times, the ambition and inhumanity too prevalent even among the clergy.

agerem, ad altare meæ ecclesiæ cantare possem, de rebus autem et facultatibus et hominibus nullam amplius haberem

potestatem.”—Hincm. Oper. ii. 697.

<sup>k</sup> Hincmar, Oper. ii. p. 689.

<sup>m</sup> P. 695.

Carloman was the fourth and youngest son of Charles the Bald. The Church had already become a provision for the younger sons of kings, who, besides this, supposed that they were propitiating Heaven by the consecration of some of their family to the service of God. Charles the Bald made two such offerings. Lothair, who was lame, was forced to become a monk, and as Abbot of Moutier St. Jean and of St. Germain d'Auxerre, maintained the decency of his station till his death. But Carloman was less suited for the cloister. Though Abbot of St. Médard, in Soissons, he was permitted to indulge his warlike inclinations in a campaign against the

A.D. 866.

Normans, with Solomon, King of Brittany. Carloman gained no great glory in this expedition, but imbibed a passion for a restless and adventurous life, unbecoming a monk. Yet abbacies were heaped upon him,<sup>a</sup> when suddenly he was arrested on a charge of conspiring against his father, stripped of all his benefices, and thrown into prison at Senlis. During the same year he was released from prison; but immediately fled into the Belgic country, raised a band of desperate robbers, and committed frightful ravages over the whole district. The king had no forces at hand to repress these outrages; he had recourse to the bishops, who, as Carloman had received deacon's orders, were urged to interpose their authority. His companions were excommunicated, and condemned, if they should be taken, to death. Carloman himself, having deceived his father by the promise of surrender, appeared again at the head of his robbers in Lorraine, ravaged the country around Toul, and crossed the mountains (the Vosges) into Burgundy. The bishops were preparing to take the extreme measure of degradation against the apostate ecclesiastic and unnatural son. To their amazement, Carloman having made a secret appeal to the Pope, letters from Hadrian appeared, espousing the cause of the robber and rebel in terms of unprecedented vehemence. Resentment for the disobedience of Charles, in the seizure of Lothair's dominions, was almost the avowed cause of this extraordinary

July 13, 871.

<sup>a</sup> "Plurimorum monasteriorum pater reputatus."—Ann. Bertin.

step. "Not only, O king, hast thou usurped the realm of others, but, surpassing the wild beasts in cruelty, thou hast not in thy rage respected thine own entrails, thy son Carloman. Like the ostrich, as we read in the holy book of Job, thou hast hardened thine heart to thy son, as though he were not thy son. Thou hast not only deprived him of his father's favour, and of all his benefices, but thou hast banished him from thy kingdom, and, what is more impious, endeavoured to procure his excommunication. But Carloman has appealed to the Apostolic See, and by the Apostolic authority we command thee to refrain from thy cruelty, and exhort thee, not, contrary to the apostle's admonition, to provoke thy children to wrath. Restore him then to thy favour; receive him as thy son with parental affection; reinstate him in his honours and his benefices, at least, till our legates arrive, who, by their authority, with due respect to the honour of both, may dispose and order all things. Heap not sin on sin, forswear thy usurpations and thy avarice, and, showing how thou hast profited by correction, seek with thy whole heart the pardon of the Church; strive to the end lest thou perish everlastingly. The term of thy crimes will be that of our rebuke, and by God's assistance thou wilt reach the end of thy guilt and of thy punishment."

Hadrian at the same time addressed the nobles of France and Lorraine to forbid them to take up arms against Carloman; and the bishops, prohibiting his excommunication. But the clergy of France made common cause with the king, above all Hincmar of Rheims, himself involved in inevitable strife with the Pope. If the king had a rebellious son and subject, supported by the Pope, Hincmar had a contumacious nephew and suffragan, who appealed to the Pope and defied the authority of his uncle and metropolitan. How far common interests had led to any secret understanding between these two rebels against the royal and archiepiscopal authority is not clear; but Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, alone of the Frankish clergy refused to subscribe to the act of degradation against Carloman. Hincmar of Laon must be made

Hincmar of  
Laon.

to pass rapidly over the scene. This turbulent nephew of Archbishop Hincmar, who bore the same name, had been advanced by misjudging nepotism in early youth to the See of Laon.<sup>o</sup> His first acts were acts of rebellion and contumacy against the metropolitan authority of his uncle. He had come into collision on an affair of property with the temporal power, and given offence to King Charles the Bald. He was summoned before a secular tribunal, deprived of a rich abbey; even the revenues of his see were sequestered. The nepotism of the elder Hincmar woke again, and entered into alliance with his lofty Churchmanship; he rebuked the unhallowed conduct of the king, who had presumed to lay his profane hands on a bishop, and to adjudge property claimed by the Church. He quoted against the king the irrefragable authority of passages from the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.<sup>p</sup> Hincmar of Laon, after an apology not too humble, was reinstated in his abbey and in the possession of his see.

In the same year came another outbreak of turbulence from Hincmar of Laon, the forcible seizure of a fief to which he laid claim; the expulsion of Nortman, a noble, by his armed men. The king took up his noble's cause; the Bishop was forced to take refuge before the altar of his church. From thence he actually lays his whole diocese under an interdict: no rite of religion is to be performed in the closed and silent churches. The elder Hincmar puts forth his metropolitan power, and annuls the interdict.<sup>q</sup> The clergy, aghast, know not whom to obey, for Hincmar of Laon had appealed to Rome: in Rome he had probably long kept up secret intelligence. He turns his own theologic weapons against his uncle; with passages from the false Decretals he limits and defies the metropolitan power. The quarrel becomes more fierce and obstinate. Council after council meet, at Pistes (866), at Gondeville (868), at Attigny; they meet in

New charges  
against Hincmar  
of Laon.

<sup>o</sup> Hincmar bitterly reproaches his nephew: "Videlicet quia statim ut a paternæ nido educationis factus Episcopus evolasti."—P. 598.

<sup>p</sup> Passages from the letters of Popes Lucius and Stephanus. The document,

pp. 316, 333.—Hincmar, Op. ii. p. 323.

<sup>q</sup> The charges of Hincmar of Rheims against Hincmar of Laon contain 55 capitula, or charges, occupying above 200 folio pages in his works, from 377 to 593.

vain. Hincmar of Rheims labours in prolix writings to assert the plenitude of metropolitan authority; he has found out that the new Decretals are not so absolutely above doubt, yet he dares not boldly to deny their authenticity. Hincmar of Laon asserts the unqualified supremacy of the Pope: Hincmar of Rheims asserts that the statutes of councils are of higher authority than the decrees of Popes; the Pope's Decretals owe their power to the authority of councils. Hincmar of Laon displays firmness worthy of a better cause: the bishops declare against him, and pronounce the interdict unlawful: the king accuses him of a breach of his oath of allegiance. He appeals to Rome; he exhibits letters of Pope Hadrian, summoning him to Rome. Already the Pope had entered into the contest; he had commanded the excommunication, without hearing or inquiry, of Nortman, the claimant and possessor of the disputed fief; he had reproved both the king and the archbishop for daring to forbid the Bishop of Laon to leave the realm and go to Rome. Hincmar of Laon fled to his city of Laon.

Interference  
of Pope  
Hadrian.  
March 26, 871.

Hincmar of Rheims now, in the name of the king, addressed an expostulation to Pope Hadrian; it was strong at once, and not undignified: "You have compelled me by your indecent letters, alike disparaging to the royal authority and unbecoming Apostolic moderation, and filled with outrage and insult, to reply in no very friendly tone. It is time that you should know that, although subject to human passions, I am a man, framed in the image of God, holding through the grace of God the royal dignity by descent from my ancestors; and, what is far greater, a Christian, an orthodox Catholic Christian, instructed from my youth in sacred and profane laws and letters.' You have neither legally nor regularly accused me of any public crime before the bishops, still less convicted me. Yet you have dared to call me a perjurer, a tyrant, a traitor, an usurper of the estates of the Church.'" He

\* On the literary cultivation of Charles the Bald, compare Sir F. Palgrave's Hist. of Normandy and England, p. 273, and note, p. 729.

\* The close of the letter is the most

remarkable part. Throughout Hincmar appeals only to the ancient accredited decretals of Leo, Celestine, Gelasius, and to the African Councils. He closes with these words: "We are not ignorant that

afterwards asserts that the Kings of France are not the Vicegerents of the bishops, but the lords of the realm; and appeals to former precedents that none of his royal ancestors had been addressed in such terms by the predecessors of the Pope. This letter, however, takes no notice of the most flagrant invasion of the royal rights, the unjustifiable interference of the Pope in favour of the rebel Carloman, which must have been still pending, or at least not determined; it dwells entirely on the affair of Hincmar, Bishop of Laon. This affair, being a revolt, as it were, against the Metropolitan power of the Archbishop of Rheims, seems put forward by that prelate, as though the crime of his own kinsman and the rebellion against spiritual authority were the more heinous offence.

Hadrian had doubtless the sagacity to perceive his error. The correspondence between the king and the Pope became on both sides more amicable.<sup>1</sup> Carloman was abandoned, and to a tragic fate.<sup>2</sup> Unable to withstand the power levied against him by his father, he again surrendered, was again imprisoned at Senlis. Two years afterwards

A.D. 871.

he was brought to trial before the bishops, and degraded from his clerical orders. His partisans, however, and Carloman, no doubt, himself, rather rejoiced in this degradation, which opened again the path of secular ambition. He might aspire, if not to the throne, to a share in the dominions of his father. The bishops had, perhaps, by this time perceived that this division of the royal dominions at the death of each successive monarch was the inherent weakness of the crown, and, dreading a contest for the throne in the distracted state of the kingdom, attacked on every side by the pagan Normans, deter-

whatever is written from the Apostolic See according to the sacred Scriptures, the preaching of the ancients, and the authority of councils, is to be held and obeyed: whatever beyond that has been compiled or forged is not only to be rejected but refuted also." "Quod sicut a quoquam fuerit compilatum sive confictum non solum respuendum sed et redarguendum esse cognovimus."—vol. ii. p. 716.

<sup>1</sup> "Quasi tumores et læsiones vestras palpare sensimus, has oleo consolationis per

dulcissimum melos caritatis, et sanctæ dilectionis unguentum fovere, lenire, et ad sanitatem perducere optamus."—Hadrian. Epist. ad Car. Carlv., Labbe, p. 937.

<sup>2</sup> See the Acts of the Synod of Doucy, Labbe, p. 1539, 1844. He was accused by the king as a perjured traitor and disturber of the public peace; by Hincmar, as contumacious against his metropolitan. Hincmar reserved to the Pope only the right of appeal given by the Council of Sardica.—Compare Planck, iii. p. 183.

mined to secure the peace of the Church and kingdom. Carloman was again put upon his trial, and condemned to death. This punishment was commuted for one more barbarous. His eyes were put out, and he was shut up in the Abbey of Corbey. His partisans contrived to carry him off, and conveyed him to the court of Louis of Germany, who named him Abbot of Esternach. He did not long survive his cruel treatment.

If the king triumphed over his rebellious son, so did Hincmar of Rheims over his rebellious nephew. Nor was the Archbishop's nephew more mercifully treated than the King's son. Hincmar of Laon suffered the same fate; he too was condemned, and suffered the loss of his eyes like Carloman. The two rebels against royal and metropolitan authority were thus joined in the same barbarous punishment. Both these events, however, took place after the death of Hadrian, during the rule of his successor. The death of Hadrian may have emboldened the clergy of France to take the affair into their own hands, and so to achieve their full victory.

Nicolas I. and Hadrian II. thus, with different success, imperiously dictating to sovereigns, ruling or attempting to rule the higher clergy in foreign countries with a despotic sway, mingling in the political revolutions of Europe, awarding crowns, and adjudging kingly inheritances, might seem the immediate ancestors of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., of Boniface VIII. But the papacy had to undergo a period of gloom and degradation, even of guilt, before it emerged again to its height of power.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

## JOHN VIII. THE SARACENS. THE DUKES OF LOWER ITALY.

THE pontificate of John VIII. is the turning point in this gradual, but rapid and almost total, change; among its causes were the extinction of the imperial branch of the Carlovingian race, and the frequent transference of the empire from one line of sovereigns to another; with the growth of the formidable dukes and counts in Italy, which overshadowed the papal power, and reduced the Pope himself to the slave or the victim of one of the contending factions. The Pope was elected, deposed, imprisoned, murdered. In the wild turbulence of the times not merely the reverence but the sanctity of his character disappeared; he sank to the common level of mortals; and the head of Christendom was as fierce and licentious as the petty princes who surrounded him, out of whose stock he sprang, and whose habits he did not break off when raised to the papal throne.

John VIII., however, still stood on the vantage ground occupied by Nicolas I. and Hadrian II. He was a Roman by birth. He signalised his pontificate by an act even more imposing than those of his predecessors, the nomination to the empire, which his language represented rather as a grant from the papal authority than as an hereditary dignity; it was a direct gift from heaven, conveyed at the will of the Pope. Already there appear indications of a French and German interest contending for the papal influence, which grows into more and more decided faction, till the Carlovingian empire is united, soon to be dissolved for ever, in the person of Charles the Fat. John VIII.

adopted the dangerous policy of a partial adherence to France. The Emperor Louis, the son of Lothair, had died without male issue. Charles the Bald was never wanting in boldness and activity to advance his

claims, just or unjust, to an increase of dominion. He marched hastily into Italy; his nobles crowded to his standard; of the two sons of Louis of Germany the elder attempted in vain to arrest, or was bribed to permit, his passage of the Alps. The Pope hastened to bestow the imperial crown on Charles. An emperor with a title so questionable was not disposed to be scrupulous as to the author of the gift. <sup>Dec. 17, 875.</sup> "We have elected," writes John VIII., "and approved, with the consent of our brothers the other bishops, of the ministers of the holy Roman Church, and of the senate and people of Rome, the King Charles, Emperor of the West." In his letters to the bishops and counts of Bavaria, whom he forbids to espouse the cause of their king in the assertion of his rightful title to the empire, or to invade the territories of Charles, the Pope describes the march of Charles as almost miraculous, and intimates throughout that he was invited by the Church, in which resided the divine power of bestowing the empire.\* No later Pope held more unmeasured language—"How do we discharge our functions as vicegerents of Christ in his Church if we do not strive for Christ against the insolence of princes?"<sup>b</sup> He speaks of "our son Louis, your glorious king, if he be a son who has always been disobedient to our holy predecessors, if glorious who has waged unhallowed wars against Christians; "*bella gerens nullos habitura triumphos*;" if a king, who cannot govern himself.<sup>c</sup> The Bavarian bishops are threatened with instant excommunication if they refuse to concur with the legates of John in preventing the war by mild or by threatening means. Another letter to the bishops who adhered to the title of Louis is still more violent; he treats them as Iscariots, as followers of the fratricide Cain. They murmur not against Charles, but against God, the giver of crowns.<sup>d</sup> But the historians are almost unanimous as to the price which Charles was

<sup>Feb. 876.</sup>

\* "*Sibi divinitus . . . . collatum.*"

—Epist. cccxvii.

<sup>b</sup> "*Ubi est quæsumus, quod vicem Christi in ecclesiâ fungimur, si pro Christo contra insolentiam principum. . . .*"—Apud Labbe, sub ann. The

whole letter is remarkable.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. cccxviii.

<sup>d</sup> "*Neque enim contra Carolum est murmur vestrum, sed contra Dominum cujus est regnum, et cui voluerit ipse dabo illud.*"—Ibid.

compelled to pay for his imperial crown. He bought the Pope, he bought the senators of Rome; he bought, if we might venture to take the words to the letter, St. Peter himself.\*

The imperial reign of Charles the Bald was short and inglorious. His brother and rival, Louis of Germany, died during the next year, but left his kingdoms and his title to the Empire to his three sons. War broke out; Charles suffered a disgraceful defeat on the Rhine by Louis of Saxony. After his second descent into Italy, where Pope John met him at Pavia, he was in danger of being cut off in his retreat by the forces of Carloman, King of Bavaria. He died on the road, in a small hamlet in the Alps. As his physician was a Jew, it was generally believed that he was poisoned; though the Jews, educated in the Arabian universities of Spain, were no doubt more advanced in medical science than any others in Europe.

John VIII., even before the death of Charles the Bald, might repent of having yielded to the temptation of bestowing the imperial crown on an obsequious but remote sovereign, who could so ill discharge his office of Protector of the Roman See. But where could he have looked for a more powerful protector against the formidable enemies which were environing the capital of Christendom on every side, the Saracens, and the no less dangerous Christian petty princes of Italy? The whole pontificate of John VIII. was a long, if at times interrupted, agony of apprehension lest Rome should fall into the hands of the unbeliever. The reign of the late Emperor Louis had been almost a continual warfare against the Mohammedans, who had now obtained a firm footing in Southern Italy. He had successfully repelled their progress, but at the death of Louis Rome was again in danger of becoming a Mohammedan city. The Pope wrote letter after letter in the most urgent and feeling language to Charles the Bald soon after he had invested him with

\* Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 876. "Beato Petro multa et pretiosa munera offerens in Imperatorem unctus et coronatus est. . . Imperatoris nomen a præsule sedis Apos-

tolicæ Johanne, ingenti pretio emerat." Ann. Met. 877. "Omnem senatum populi Romani, more Jugurthino corrupti, sibi que sociavit."—Ann. Fulden.

the empire.<sup>f</sup> "If all the trees in the forest," such is the style of the Pope, "were turned into tongues, they could not describe the ravages of these impious pagans; the devout people of God is destroyed by a continual slaughter: he who escapes the fire and the sword is carried as a captive into exile. Cities, castles, and villages are utterly wasted, and without an inhabitant. The bishops are wandering about in beggary, or fly to Rome as the only place of refuge." The well-known story, whether false or true, by the belief which it obtained, shows the deadly hatred between the Christians and the Moslemin, and the horrors of the war. Salerno was besieged by the Saracens (this was at an earlier period, about the accession of John VIII.): the gallant defence of the city by Count Guaifer probably retarded at that time their career of conquest. The Saracen general, or king as he is called, is said to have violated a number of Christian nuns on the altar in the church of St. Fortunatus. While in this act of cruelty and guilt to one of them he was crushed by a huge beam, which fell or was skilfully detached from the wall. The maiden escaped unhurt.<sup>g</sup> The usual appellation of the Saracens by the Pope is Hagarenes, sons of fornication and wrath. In a passage in a later letter to Count Boso, the Pope describes the Saracens as an army of locusts, turning the whole land into a wilderness: extensive regions were so desolate as to be inhabited only by wild beasts.<sup>h</sup> The most terrible intelligence of all is that an armament of three hundred ships, fifteen of which carried cavalry, was in preparation to attack and conquer Rome. "Consider," says the Pope, "what a vast and unparalleled<sup>i</sup> evil this would be; the loss of that city would be the ruin of the world, the peril of Christianity itself." In another pressing letter to Charles the Bald he says, "All Campania is a desert; the Hagarenes have crossed the Tiber, and are wasting the suburban district; they destroy all churches and shrines; massacre the monks and clergy.<sup>k</sup>" Somewhat later he alludes to the starvation of Rome; some of the

<sup>f</sup> Ad Carol Calv. Imper. apud Bouquet, p. 471.

<sup>g</sup> Anonym. Salern.

<sup>h</sup> *c. g.* Epist. xxxviii.

<sup>i</sup> Incomparable!

<sup>k</sup> He entreats the Empress Richildis to influence her husband to protect him; his whole realm is confined within the walls of the city.—Epist. xxx.

senate were in danger of perishing with hunger.<sup>m</sup> All this time, bitterly complains the Pope, the Christians, instead of flying to the relief of the Roman see, were engaged in unnatural wars against each other; wars in which John forgets his own concern.

Yet, if possible, even more formidable than the infidels were the petty Christian princes of Italy. "The canker-worm eats what the locust has left," these appear to have been the inferior nobles, the marquises (mar-chiones) in the neighbourhood of Rome. The more powerful princes seized likewise every opportunity of confusion to enrich themselves or to enlarge their dominions. "Those," writes Pope John to the emperor, "who are not unknown to you, trample down all our rights in the Roman territory, seize all that the Saracens have spared; so that there is not a single herd of cattle in all our domain, nor a single human being to commiserate or lament the desolation."<sup>n</sup> In many parts of Italy had gradually arisen independent dukedoms; and none of these appear to have felt any religious respect for the Pope, some not for Christianity. They were ready on every occasion to assail and plunder the city itself: for which they were sometimes punished, when the imperial power was strong; more often they defied its impotence. A Transalpine emperor was too distant to maintain awe for any long time. In the South were the old Lombard Dukes of Benevento and Spoleto, the Duke of Naples, who owned a kind of remote fealty to the Eastern Empire, the Princes of Capua, Salerno, and Amalfi. On the vacancy after the death of Pope Nicolas, Lambert of Spoleto had occupied and pillaged Rome,<sup>o</sup> respecting neither monastery nor church, and carrying off a great number of young females of the highest rank.<sup>p</sup> Adelgis, the Duke of Benevento, had dared to seize in that city the sacred person of the Emperor Louis.<sup>q</sup> The Emperor had fled with

<sup>m</sup> Epist. xlv.

<sup>n</sup> Epist. xxx.

<sup>o</sup> The cause of this insurrection was the rapacity of the Empress Engelburga and the cruelty of the French soldiery with her.—Anastas. in Vit. Hadrian.

<sup>p</sup> At a later period, as appears by a letter of Pope John VIII., the same Lambert had demanded the chief of the Roman

nobility to be surrendered to him as hostages.—Ann. Bertin.; Ann. Fulden. sub ann. 871; Muratori, Ann. d'Italia, ibid.

<sup>q</sup> Erchempert assigns two reasons why God permitted this humiliation of Louis: because he had insulted Pope Nicolas, and spared two Saracen kings, whom he might have put to death as Saul did Agag.—Apud Pertz, p. 253.

his wife and a few soldiers to a lofty tower, in which he was besieged, and glad to accept terms of capitulation.<sup>†</sup> He was only permitted to leave the city after he had taken a solemn oath to Adelgis—an oath in which his wife, his daughter, and all his attendants were compelled to join—that he would neither in his own person nor by any other revenge this act of insolent rebellion. No sooner, however, had Louis reached Ravenna in safety than he sent to the Pope to absolve him from his oath. Hadrian II., then Pope, began to assert that dangerous privilege of absolution from solemn and recorded oaths.<sup>‡</sup> The two Lamberts of Spoleto were accused of conniving at, if not consenting to, this daring exploit.

The Duke of Naples, the Greek Emperor's subject, acted altogether as an independent prince. Sergius, who had succeeded his father in the Neapolitan dukedom, was accused of secret and friendly intelligence with the Saracens; of supplying their piratical fleets with provisions, and thus purchasing security for his own dominions by sacrificing the rest of Southern Italy. His uncle, Athanasius, Bishop of Naples (the high families of Italy now, as well as of the Franks, aspired to ecclesiastical dignities), had, at the commencement of his reign, reproved him for this alliance with the Unbeliever. Sergius, once imprisoned, afterwards drove his uncle, the bishop, into exile. After the death of the Emperor Louis, during the reign of Charles the Bald, the Pope, John VIII., was more earnestly desirous of breaking this unhallowed league between the so-called Christian and the Saracen. He tried in vain anathema and excommunication; at length he appeared in person at the head of an army with the two Lamberts, Dukes of Spoleto, who had received orders from the Emperor, Charles the Bald, to assist him.<sup>§</sup> Guaifer, Prince of Salerno; Palear, Prefect of Amalfi;

<sup>†</sup> The popular verses current at the time show the profound impression made by this act of treason against the imperial majesty. It is a curious transition specimen of Italo-Latin:—

"Audite omnes fines terre, horrore cum tristitia,  
Quale scelus fuit factum Benevento Civitas,  
Ludovicum comprehenderunt sancto plo Augusto."

The descent of the Saracens in great force was thought a providential visitation for the crime of the Beneventans.

<sup>‡</sup> Liutprand.—Regino, lib. ii.

<sup>§</sup> Erchempert. Muratori, Ann. d'Italia, A.D. 877.

and Docibilis, Duke of Gaeta, were also on too friendly terms with the Saracens.<sup>6</sup> In a conflict between the two armies, twenty-two Neapolitans were taken and beheaded, as under the papal anathema, with the sanction of the Pope.<sup>7</sup> A second Athanasius, the brother of Duke Sergius, had succeeded to his uncle as Bishop of Naples. He was a man of lawless and unmeasured ambition, but with specious cunning sacrificed, as it seemed, all the ties of kindred and of blood to the cause of the Pope and of Christianity. He organised a formidable party in Naples, seized and imprisoned his brother the duke, and sent him blinded to Rome, where he died shortly after in misery and disgrace.<sup>8</sup> The Bishop then took possession of the vacant dukedom; the civil and ecclesiastical offices met in his person, as they had at Capua in the Bishop Landulf. The Pope, John VIII., highly approved of this usurpation, commended Athanasius because he had overthrown the new Holofernes, and had not spared his own flesh and blood. The Pope betrayed his inward triumph that a churchman had thus assumed the secular authority: he wrote to the people of Naples confirming the title of Athanasius, and declared that divine inspiration must have guided them in the wise choice of such a ruler.<sup>9</sup>

Nov. 877.

But the bishop-duke did not scruple to return to the unhallowed policy of his brother: he entered into a new league with the Saracens, gave them quarters, and, actually uniting his troops with theirs, defeated the forces of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno, and opened a

A.D. 877.

<sup>6</sup> By the assistance of Erchempert we trace the rise and progress of this race of lawless, independent princes. The busiest and not least lawless were the Bishops (in general of the ruling family) Landulf of Capua and Athanasius of Naples. Of these, Landulf, one of the four sons of Lando, Prince of Capua, became Bishop of Capua. Erchempert insinuates against him the worst vices — and he hated monks! — P. 251. Yet John consented to his episcopate. “Pandenulfus Landenulphum germanum suum conjugatum clericum fecit episcopum, mittensque Romam Johanni Papæ episcopum fieri exposcit, a quo et exauditus est.” — Ib. 255.

Athanasius is briefly described: “Episcopus et magister militum.”

<sup>7</sup> “Octavo die anathematis xxii. Neapolites milites apprehensos decollari fecit: sic enim monuerat Papa.” — Erchempert, 39.

<sup>8</sup> The fifth letter of John seems to have been to Athanasius soon after his promotion to the bishopric. He there threatens Sergius with an irrevocable anathema (non dissolvendum). — Labbe, Concil. ix. p. 5. “Et Romam mittitur suffossis oculis.” — Erchempert.

<sup>9</sup> Ad pop. Napolit. Compare also Epist. xlv.

free passage for their incursions to the gates of Rome. It was this danger which caused so much alarm to Pope John, and called forth such loud and urgent clamours for aid from the Transalpine powers.\* The united troops of the Christian bishop and the Saracens devastated the whole region, plundering convents and churches, desolating "towns, villages, cities, hills, mountains, and islands." Even the famous and holy monasteries of St. Benedict and St. Vincent did not escape.<sup>b</sup>

All hopes of succour from the Emperor, Charles the Bald, had been frustrated by his retreat from Lombardy and his death. The Pope, who had gone to meet him at Vercelli, and had held a council at Ravenna, returned only to submit to an ignominious tribute to the Saracens. In vain he launched his anathemas: while they struck with terror remoter parts of Christendom, they were treated with contempt by these lawless chieftains.<sup>c</sup>

The Imperial crown was again vacant, and claimed by the conflicting houses of France and Germany.<sup>d</sup> But Carloman, son of Louis of Germany, had been acknowledged as King of Italy. Probably as partisans of the German, and to compel the Pope to abandon the interest of the French line, to which he adhered with unshaken fidelity, Lambert, Duke of Spoleto, that anti-Christ, as the Pope described him,<sup>e</sup> with his adulterous sister,

April 28, 878.

\* John hoped to obtain assistance from the Greek Emperor Basil, against his *subject*, as well as against the Saracens. The Greek fleet was in those seas; he begged him to send ten large vessels (*achelaudra*) for the protection of Rome.—Epist. xlv. This is urged to excuse the weakness of John in consenting to the patriarchate of Photius.—See above, page 357.

<sup>b</sup> Joan. Epist. lxvi. lxvii. In one of the expeditions of Pandenulfus, one of the princes of Capua, who joined the Neapolitans and Saracens, the monk, the writer of the history of the Lombard princes, was taken, stripped of all he had, and carried away captive.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. xlv. Docibilis, Duke of Gaeta, had surrendered a fortress, on which, it was said, depended the safety of Rome.

<sup>d</sup> From the battle of Fontenoy and the treaty of Verdun took place the final

separation between France and Germany. Charles the Bald took his oath in Roman, Louis in German. The Roman and the Teutonic had begun their antagonism.—See Palgrave, p. 66.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. lx. There are two letters to Lambert (lxii. and lxiii.), from the latter of which he appears to have treated the Pope with great disrespect, and to have assumed some control over the Legations (Ann. Fulden. sub ann.; see also lxxxii.). The Pope disguises this, and accuses Lambert himself of aspiring to the empire. He had before charged him with a design of permanently occupying the territory of St. Peter and the Holy City; of having sent an embassy to Sorrento to conclude an alliance with the Saracens, and to invite a reinforcement of their troops.—Epist. ad Concil. Trec. xc.

Richildis, and his accomplice, the treacherous Adelbert, Count of Tuscany, at the head of an irresistible force, entered Rome, seized and confined the Pope, and endeavoured to starve him into concession, and compelled the clergy and the Romans to take an oath of allegiance to Carloman, as King of Italy. For thirty days the religious services were interrupted; not a single lamp burned on the altars.\*

No sooner had they retired than the Pope caused all the sacred treasures to be conveyed from St. Peter's to the Lateran, covered the altar of St. Peter with sackcloth, closed the doors, and refused to permit the pilgrims from distant lands to approach the shrine: he then fled to Ostia, and embarked for France.

When he reached the shores of Provence, John VIII. felt himself in another world. Instead of turbulent and lawless enemies (such were the Counts and Dukes of Italy), whose rapacity or animosity paid no respect to sacred things, and treated the Pope like an ordinary mortal, the whole kingdom of France might seem to throw itself humbly at his feet. He was received at

Arles by Boso, Duke of Lombardy, master, like wise shortly to become King, of Provence,<sup>f</sup> and whose ambition aspired to the Empire. Boso had married, it was said by force, after having poisoned his first wife, Ermengard,<sup>g</sup> the daughter of the Emperor, Louis II. Wherever the Pontiff went he was received with the highest honours. He summoned a council to be held at Troyes. Louis the Stammerer, King of France; the three kings, the sons of Louis of Germany, were cited to appear. Louis alone obeyed the mandate.

No Pope was more prodigal of excommunication than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300, it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten, inflict, or at least allude

\* The clearest description of this is in letters to the Archbishop of Ravenna, to Count Berengarius, the Empress Ingelberga, and to Louis the Stammerer.—lxxxiv. vii.

<sup>f</sup> On the advancement of Boso to the throne of Provence, see Bouché, *Hist. de Provence*, pp. 738, 769; Palgrave, note

744. The Pope's first act was to erect Arles into a metropolitan see, and to grant the pallium to the Bishop Rostagne; afterwards he appointed him Legate, with full powers.—*Epist.* xc. et seqq.

<sup>g</sup> Ermengard was the last of the line of Lothair, the eldest son of Louis the Pious.—*Epist.* cxvii.

to this last exercise of sacerdotal power.<sup>b</sup> The Council of Troyes opened with the recital and confirmation of the papal anathema against Adelbert of Tuscany and Lambert of Spoleto. The anathema was ratified with one voice by the assembled bishops, and commanded to be published in all their churches, and those of their suffragans. Formosus, Bishop of Porto, the Apostle of the Bulgarians, afterwards Pope, the head, it seems, of the German faction, was involved with all his accomplices in one sentence of excommunication, degraded, and anathematised. The obsequious episcopal senate echoed each anathema with perfect concord. Another broad and sweeping excommunication comprehended all persons who should in any way usurp the property of the Church; they were excluded from the communion of the faithful, and, if they persisted in not making restitution, deprived of Christian burial. The Pope did not scruple, of his own authority and that of the council, to make an addition to the fundamental laws of the Transalpine realm. He found the Teutonic code imperfect, as containing no statute against sacrilege; he caused to be inserted that in the Justinian code, mitigating the fine from five pounds of pure gold to thirty pounds of tried silver. In return for this humble resignation of his authority, John VIII. condescended to crown Louis the Stammerer King of France; Sept. 7, 878. his queen was excluded from that honour, on account of some irregularity in her marriage. He rendered, moreover, to Louis the service of excommunicating some of his enemies, especially Bernhard, Marquis of Languedoc. The execution of this act was confided to another Bernhard, of Provence, who was to be rewarded out of the confiscation. Nothing was too lofty to defy, nothing too mean to escape, the fulminations of John. He will soon appear anathematising the three great Archbishops of Italy—of Milan, Ravenna, and Naples:<sup>c</sup> he launched an excommunication, addressed to all Christians, against some thieves

<sup>b</sup> The wiser Nicolas had warned bishops against too frequent use of this precious weapon: "Non temere ad excommunicationes procedant . . . ne auc-

toritas episcopalis vilescat."—Labbe, viii. 562.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. cxxviii., Milan, May 1, 879; cclxxviii., Ravenna; cclxx., Naples.

who had stolen his horses, and a silver cup belonging to St. Peter, when he was on his way to Troyes.<sup>k</sup>

The indefatigable Pope returned over the Alps by the Mont Cenis, Turin, and Pavia; but of all whom he had so commandingly exhorted, and so earnestly implored to march for his protection against the Saracens, and no doubt against his Italian enemies, none obeyed but Duke Boso of Provence.<sup>m</sup> For this extraordinary mark of fidelity, the Pope showed extraordinary gratitude; he declared him as Duke of Lombardy his adopted son. As the son of Louis the Stammerer, Carloman, was married to the daughter of Duke Boso, the Pope was thus bound in closer alliance with the house of France. The ambition of Count Boso aspired, after the death of Carloman, King of Italy, to the

A.D. 879.

Empire. The death of Louis the Stammerer, and the intrigues concerning the succession to the throne of France, thwarted in one way the policy of the pontiff; in another, seemed to encourage his ambition, at least to strengthen, rather than mitigate, his animosity to the German Carolingians. He wrote to Charles the Fat,<sup>n</sup> the King of Swabia, hereafter to be Emperor, to warn him, under peril of excommunication, against any invasion on the dominions of Boso, his adopted son.<sup>o</sup> This was to close the gates of Italy against the Germans, to keep them beyond the Alps. If it had been the policy of John to erect a firm, hereditary kingdom in the north of Italy, in alliance with, and as a protector of the papacy against the Saracen and the lawless southern dukes, his object might, perhaps, justify this usurpation of authority. But his sole design was to obtain a kingdom for his adopted son. He attempted to summon a council at Pavia, as obsequious as that which had met at Troyes.<sup>p</sup> In tone, partly of persuasion, partly of menace, he cited Anspert, Archbishop of Milan; Berengar, Duke of Friuli; the

<sup>k</sup> Epist. xcvi. In the Council of Troyes, which closed Sept. 878, the episcopal dignity was asserted by a decree that all the public authorities should pay the bishop the respect due to his rank—not sit in his presence till leave was granted; and this assertion

was likewise guarded by excommunication.—Labbe, Concil. p. 314.

<sup>m</sup> John, Epist. cxix.; Labbe, p. 89.

<sup>n</sup> Charles the Fat was the eldest of the three sons of Louis the Germanic.

<sup>o</sup> Epist. ccxi. et seqq.

<sup>p</sup> Epist. cxxvi. cxxviii.

Bishops of Parma, Placentia, Reggio, and Modena. Four times was Anspert summoned, twice at least excommunicated, and threatened with the utmost power of the Roman See.<sup>a</sup> By this excommunication of Anspert he would establish his despotic authority over the Bishops of Lombardy. But Anspert and the Italian Prelates and Counts paid not the least respect to the papal summons or the papal excommunication: they neither appeared at Pavia, nor in obedience to a later summons at Rome.<sup>b</sup> In Provence the adopted son of the Pope met with better success among the clergy. A synod of ecclesiastics met at a place called Montaille, in the territory of Vienne, and assumed the right of founding a new kingdom, of disregarding the rights of the sons of Louis the Stammerer, and of investing Boso with the title of King of Provence and of Arles. The influence of the Pope had no doubt great weight with the Bishops of this Council. Boso is said to have paved the way for his elevation by the promise of wealthy abbeys to be attached, by royal and papal authority, to the Episcopal Sees.<sup>c</sup> The Council consisted of the Archbishops of Vienne and Lyons, of the Tarantaise, and of Aix, with seventeen suffragan Bishops. Of their sole authority, though with some tacit consent of the nobles, compelled by the necessity of providing for the security of their churches, and acting at least with the implied assertion of divine commission,<sup>d</sup> they elect the King, but do not define the boundaries or extent of his kingdom. In their address they strongly impress on Boso his royal duties, especially regard for the honour of God, the protection of the Catholic faith, the exaltation of the Church. Boso received the gift with profound humility; he acknowledged that he received the crown from their good-will alone, and promised the fullest obedience to God's inspired priests.<sup>e</sup> Thus Councils had become

Excommunication of Archbishop of Milan.

Boso king of Provence.

<sup>a</sup> He afterwards invested the Bishop of Pavia, in legatine authority, with full power of excommunication; he interfered in the appointment of Anspert's successor, degraded a bishop consecrated by Anspert, and named another in his place. To the death of Anspert, John considered him under the sentence of excommunication.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. clxxxi. clxxxii.

<sup>c</sup> Labbe, Concil. Arles signs as Episcopus; but he had already received the pallium from John.—Epist. xcii. et seq.

<sup>d</sup> "Nostri Dei, per suffragia sanctorum . . . Christo præduce."

<sup>e</sup> Apud Labbe, Concil. ix. p. 333.

Diets or Parliaments, awarded and carved out kingdoms : the nobles of Provence make neither protest nor remonstrance.

Pope John in the mean time was compelled to crown the Emperor, Charles the Fat. Charles had marched with a preponderating force into Italy; John had met him at Ravenna, reluctant but obedient.<sup>2</sup> Though Charles was of the German line, the Pope yielded, yet he yielded with haughty condescension. "We have called you by the authority of our letters, for the advantage and exaltation of the Church, to the Imperial Sovereignty." The Pope enjoins him before his arrival in Rome to send some of his chief officers to ratify, in his name, all the privileges of the Roman See. He acknowledges the Emperor's power of making ordinances concerning the territory of St. Peter, which he is bound to protect against the Saracens and evil-minded Christians: "The Church must suffer no diminution, but rather be augmented in her rights and possessions."<sup>3</sup>

Charles the Fat, crowned Emperor,<sup>4</sup> by degrees became master of the whole dominions of Charlemagne. For a few years the Empire of the West displayed its ancient unity; the kingdom of Arles stood in precarious independence; but though he received at Rome the Imperial Crown, the Emperor could afford no efficient protection against the Mohammedans. The Pope, who was founding kingdoms beyond the Alps, who was again interfering in the ecclesiastical quarrels of Constantinople, alternately absolving and excommunicating the Patriarch Photius, confirming or annulling the so-called general Council of Constantinople, was trembling within the walls of Rome at the invasion of the Saracens, and in vain heaping interdict on interdict, not merely on the secular princes, but against an ecclesiastic, a more dangerous enemy.

Athanasius, the Duke-Bishop of Naples, still maintained in secret his unholy alliance with the enemies of the Cross.<sup>5</sup> The Pope visited Naples,<sup>6</sup> in order to persuade him to

<sup>2</sup> Aug. 879, Hincmar Annal.

<sup>3</sup> Epist. ccxvi. ccxvii.

<sup>4</sup> Coronation of Charles, Christmas 880, or early in 881. See Muratori, sub ann.; Jaffé, Feb., March, 881. The western empire of Charles was properly only from

884 to 887.

<sup>5</sup> Athanasius stood by no means alone. See the excommunication of the people of Amalfi for the same cause.—Epist. ccxxv. and ccxlii.

<sup>6</sup> Epist. ccxxvii.

join the other Dukes in a general defensive league against the common enemy of Christendom. He offered large sums of money, which Athanasius received with unscrupulous avidity, and pledged himself to break off his wicked alliance. But the perfidious Prelate not merely kept up his amicable relations with the Saracens, he punctually received his share of the booty made during their ravages.<sup>c</sup> The Pope, in the most solemn manner, pronounced the sentence of excommunication; he declared April 8, 881. Athanasius suspended from his office, and cut off from the communion of the Church.<sup>d</sup> It was not till a year after that Athanasius yielded, or pretended to yield, to the terrors of the sentence. He sent a deacon to Rome to assure the Pope that he had abandoned his infidel allies; but the mistrustful Pope demanded, before he would grant the absolution which he sought, some more convincing evidence of his sincerity. He required that Athanasius should commit himself with his old allies, by an act of signal perfidiousness and cruelty; that he should seize the chief of the Mohammedans, send them to Rome, and massacre the rest in the presence of the Legates. By this *Christian* act, demanded by the head of Christendom, he was to obtain readmission to the Christian Church, and the right to officiate as a Christian Bishop.\* It is almost impossible to trace the intricate labyrinth of intrigue, treachery, crime, war, which filled the later years of this Duke-Bishop. Nothing was done without an oath; and no oath influenced for a day his policy or his actions. His great object was to make himself master of Capua, an object seemingly attainable through the deadly feuds of the various descendants of the Ducal house, whom Lando, the Bishop, had committed in interminable strife. They, in their revenge, as each party obtained or lost the mastery at each turn, made or degraded a Bishop. The Saracens in the mean time, courted by all parties, impartially plundered all, made or broke alliances with the same

<sup>c</sup> Epist. cclxvii.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. cclxx.

\* "Atque si præsentibus his nostris, Marino videlicet reverendissimo episcopo et sanctæ sedis nostræ arcario, et

Sicone egregio viro, majores Saracenorum quantos melius potes, quos nominatim quærimus, cum aliis omnibus capere, et, aliis omnibus jugulatis, eos nobis direxeris."—Epist. ccxciv. 882.

facility with the Christians,<sup>f</sup> while the poor monks, even of St. Benedict's own foundation, lived in perpetual fear or spoliation. The last days of John VIII. were occupied in writing more and more urgent letters for aid to Charles the Fat, in warfare, or providing means of war against his Saracen and Christian foes, or dealing excommunications on all sides; yet facing with gallant resolution the foes of his person and his power.

This violent Pope is said (but by one writer only)<sup>g</sup> to have come to a violent end: his brains were  
 Dec. 15, 882. beaten out with a mallet by some enemy, covetous of his wealth and ambitious of the papal crown. That he had enemies who would not have scrupled at such a crime rests on his own acknowledgment, and these were men of high rank and official dignity. In the early years of his pontificate, Gregory the Nomenclator, and George his son-in-law, are accused of having for eight years,  
 April 19, 876. that is almost during the whole pontificate of John, committed the most enormous crimes, and aimed at seizing the papacy. The actual crime which called for the terrible sentence of anathema against these men was a conspiracy either to murder the Pope and his faithful adherents,<sup>h</sup> or to introduce the Saracens into the city.<sup>i</sup> They had been cited to answer this charge; and, after much suspicious delay, had seized a large portion of the treasures of the Church, passed the gate of St. Pancrazia with false keys, and left it open to the marauding Saracens, who might have surprised Rome. It is the most remarkable part of the affair that Formosus, Bishop of Porto, called the Apostle of the Bulgarians, and afterwards Pope, is involved as an accomplice in these dark charges, and named in the same sentence of excommunication.

<sup>f</sup> "Saraceni invitati ab omnibus, omnia diruunt, omnia consumunt." 3

<sup>g</sup> Ann. Fuldens. Contin.

<sup>h</sup> "Summum Romanæ urbis pontificium, conjurantibus sibi dudum suis complicitibus factione præripere affectavit."  
—Epist. cccxix.

<sup>i</sup> "Donec aut nos cum fidelibus ecclesiæ Dei potuissent perimere, aut Saracenos, quos jam per suos familiarissimos sequè Saracenos invitaverant, in Roma-

nam urbem ad perditionem omnium intrmittere valuissent."—Ibid. The letter which relates this conspiracy and the excommunication is addressed to the bishops of Gaul and Germany; and it is remarkable that it dwells strongly on the conspiracy being an act of treason, not to the Church only, but "contra salutem reipublicæ et regni dilecti filii nostri, Caroli, serenissimi principis."

Yet the specific offences urged against Formosus are of a totally different kind—disobedience to the Roman See, and an attempt to raise Bulgaria into a new province independent of the Pope. From early times the Bishop of Rome in his person had been less an object of awe and less secure in Rome than in any part of his spiritual dominions; but this conspiracy anticipated the coming darkness of the next century. Either the Pope grounded on a false and wicked invention, or, at the best, on an unwarranted suspicion, this most terrible accusation; or there were persons of the highest rank in the service of the Pope, so blinded with faction, so infatuated with crime (for, according to the Pope, they were men of the most rapacious and licentious habits), on whom their allegiance to the Pope hung so loosely as not to make them shudder at shedding the blood of the successor of St. Peter, or at surrendering the metropolis of Christendom to the unbeliever.

Almost the first act of Marinus,<sup>k</sup> the successor of John VIII., was the absolution of Formosus, his release from his oath not to enter Rome,<sup>m</sup> and his reconciliation with the Holy See. Pope Marinus.  
Dec. 882. The decided partisanship of this measure declares the triumph of the German faction, and makes it more probable that the vacancy was caused by violent means. The enforced acknowledgment of Charles the Fat, as the master of the whole Carlovinian empire, by John VIII., would not necessarily combine the factions arrayed against each other during years of fierce animosity. It was a German Emperor who again ruled the world, and his supporters would seize the opportunity of more than triumph, of revenge. The short pontificate of Marinus was followed by the still shorter rule of Hadrian III., which lasted but fourteen months. That of Stephen V., though not of longer duration, witnessed

<sup>k</sup> Marinus, or Martinus II., 882, died May or June 884.

<sup>m</sup> Formosus had sworn (at Troyes, Sept. 14, 878) never to enter Rome, or to resume his episcopal dignity. "Formosus enim nequam angustatus jure-

jurando promisit: ut Romuleam urbem nunquam ingrederetur, ad reconciliationem sui honoris nunquam accederet, suumque episcopatum nunquam reciperet."—Auxilii Trec. apud Mabillon, *Analect. Vet.* p. 51.

events of far more importance to the papacy, to Italy, and to Christendom.

On the death of Charles the Fat, the ill-cemented edifice of the Carlovingian empire, the discordant materials of which had reunited, not by natural affinity, but almost by the force of accident, dissolved again, and for ever. The legitimate race of Charlemagne expired in the person of his unworthy descendant, whose name, derived from mere physical bulk, contrasted with the mental greatness, the commanding qualities of military, administrative, and even intellectual grandeur, which had blended with the name of the first Charles the appellation of the Great.

---

A.D. 887.

## CHAPTER VII.

## ANARCHY OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE PAPACY.

AT the expiration of the Carolingian dynasty the question between the conflicting claims of the Transalpine sovereigns to the Empire was for a short time in abeyance. Italy aspired to name her own king, to assume that the Empire belonged of right to the King of Italy. But there was no one of her dukes, either of Lombard or Italian descent, so pre-eminent in power and influence as to command the unanimous assent: no Pope on the throne of Rome who could seize this glorious opportunity of securing the independence of Italy. Pope had been following Pope in rapid succession; and the feuds in Italy and in Rome, though the main cause of their animosity, the Imperial title, might seem removed, raged with unallayed ferocity. Guido, Duke of Spoleto, and Berengar, Duke of Friuli, were put forward as competitors for the empire by their respective partisans in the South and in the North. At first Berengar and Guido agreed amicably to share the spoil. Guido hoped to obtain the Transalpine, Berengar the Cisalpine dominions.\* But Guido had formed some wild hopes of succeeding peaceably to the French dominions of Charles the Fat. He entered, it is said, into an amicable arrangement with Berengar; and while his antagonist was strengthening his interest in Italy, crossed the Alps on his adventurous quest after the crown of Burgundy. He returned with the shame of having been scorned and foiled in this enterprise, and with the just imputation, which probably affected him much more, of having broken faith with Berengar, and so weakened the claims which he hastened to resume upon the kingdom of Italy. The dukes and counts of Italy were divided. Those of Spoleto, Camerina, Tus-

Berengar and Guido assume the crown of Italy.

\* Liutprand, apud Pertz, p. 250

cany, joined the banner of Guido; the Lombards were generally on the side of Berengar. The bishops did not stand aloof from the war; they appeared in arms on either side; yet the general feeling was still so strong against the unseemliness of Christian prelates mingling in battle, that the poetical panegyrist of Berengar, out of respect for the sacred ministry, refuses to record their names.<sup>b</sup> Two bloody battles were fought, one in the Brescian territory, one near the Trebia. In the last Guido won the victory, and took possession of Pavia, with great part of Lombardy. An assembly of bishops in Pavia assumed the right of electing Guido to the kingdom

Popes Hadrian III. and Stephen V.

of Italy.<sup>c</sup> After the death of Marinus, Hadrian III. had ruled rather more than one obscure year.<sup>d</sup> The Pope Stephen V. had been chosen during the lifetime of Charles the Fat, in the presence of the Imperial ambassador; yet the last Carolingian resisted the assumption of the full Papal power without his special consent. Stephen V. was crowned by

Feb. 21, 891.

Formosus, Bishop of Porto.<sup>e</sup> Stephen had espoused the cause of Guido with ardour. The King of Italy came to Rome, and was crowned as Emperor by

Sept. 891.

the Pope.<sup>f</sup> The death of Stephen, and the election of Formosus to the Papacy, changed the aspect of affairs, and betrayed the hostilities still rankling at Rome. By the election of Formosus was violated the ordinary canonical rule against the translation of bishops from one see to another (Formosus was Bishop of Porto), which was still held in some respect. There were yet stronger objections to the election of a bishop who had been excommunicated by a former Pontiff, excommunicated as an accomplice in a conspiracy to murder the Pope. The excommunicated Formosus had been com-

<sup>b</sup> Apud Muratori, t. ii. p. 1. Throughout this poem Berengar is an Italian; Wido (Guido), a Gaul (Gallicus ductor); Arnulf, a German: he is the "Ductor Barbarus." The national distinctions and national animosities are growing more marked and strong.

<sup>c</sup> See in Muratori the decrees of this Council. There is a remarkable popular provision. The commonalty (plebeii

homines) were to be governed by their law. All illegal exaction or oppression was prohibited. Such injuries were to be redressed by the count; on his neglect or refusal, by the bishop, who, for this end, was to use his power of excommunication.—Art. vii. p. 415.

<sup>d</sup> May, 884; Aug., Sept., 885.

<sup>e</sup> *Invectiv. pro Formoso*, apud Anastas.

<sup>f</sup> *Annal. Fuldens. sub ann.*

pelled to take an oath never to resume his episcopal functions, never to return to Rome, and never to presume but to lay communion. The successor of John had granted absolution from these penalties—from this oath. This election must have been a bold and desperate measure of an unscrupulous faction.<sup>s</sup> Formosus was not chosen without a fierce and violent struggle.<sup>h</sup> The suffrages of a party among the clergy and people had already fallen upon Sergius. He was actually at the altar preparing for the solemn ceremony of inauguration, when he was torn away by the stronger faction. Formosus, chosen, as his partisans declared, for his superior learning and knowledge of the Scripture, was then invested in the Papal dignity. Sergius fled to Tuscany, which adhered to the cause of Guido, or an Italian emperor. Formosus and his faction may have preferred the common Papal policy, which dreaded the dangerous neighbourhood, it might be the despotic power, of an Italian emperor, and, as churchmen, thought the pontifical power more secure under the protection of a remote Transalpine Emperor. Personal hostility to Guido may have allied itself with this feeling; yet was Formosus compelled to send the Imperial diadem to Lambert, the son of Guido.<sup>i</sup> Already the Formosans were in correspondence with Arnulf, whom Germany at least had then acknowledged as the heir, though illegitimate, of the Carolingian house,—the sole heir of that famous race. Already Arnulf had claimed and exercised a kind of imperial supremacy; his authority ratified the election of King Boso to the throne of Arles (or Provence); he had threatened to descend on Italy at the first assumption of the kingly title by Berengar; but Berengar, eager for his revenge against Guido, now joined in the invitation of the Transalpine sovereign.<sup>k</sup>

Sept. 891.  
Inauguration  
of Formosus.

Feb. 27, 892.

<sup>s</sup> Liutprand, sub ann. 891.

<sup>h</sup> "Stephano quoque Papa, Adriani filio, viam universæ terræ ingresso, adunati sunt episcopi proceresque tui, clerici quoque et populus cunctaque vulgi manus, et venerunt in sedem Portuensem infra urbem sitam, cui Formosus præerat, papam eum acclamantes."—Auxil. Trec. apud Mabill.

<sup>i</sup> Jaffé adopts this chronology seemingly on strong grounds. But I cannot help suspecting that this is an anticipation of the act of submission from Formosus, after the retreat of Arnulf.

<sup>k</sup> Document in Muratori, 893; Annal. Fuldens. Arnulf is summoned "ad Italicum regnum et res S. Petri a malis Christianis cruendum."

Arnulf crossed the Alps at the head of a powerful army. He was received in Verona by Berengar, and one terrible example of German ferocity prostrated Italy at his feet in shuddering consternation. Bergamo dared to offer resistance; he hung the Count in full armour and with all the ornaments of his rank before the gates, and gave the town up to pillage.<sup>1</sup> In the language of the day, it made the ears of all who heard tingle. Milan and Pavia opened their gates. Guido fled to his territory of Spoleto. Even the powerful princes, the Marquis of Tuscany among the rest, were unable to stand before the terrors of the German arms. Their presumption in claiming certain feudal rights was resented by Arnulf. They were compelled to swear allegiance to Arnulf, as King of Italy; the claims of Berengar were dismissed with silent contempt.<sup>m</sup> But Italy, as usual, revenged herself by her climate on the northern army. Sickness broke out, and Arnulf turned back to the Alps. No sooner was he withdrawn than the party of Guido, now strengthened by many other Italian princes, who had been offended by the pride of the Barbarian Arnulf, rose up and threw off the yoke. Guido had died,<sup>n</sup> but his son Lambert, already his colleague, assumed alone the kingdom of Italy and the Imperial crown; even Pope Formosus was obliged to affect an ill-assumed concord with the Italian Lambert.<sup>o</sup>

But the next year<sup>p</sup> appeared again the invincible Arnulf. Italy quailed before him. Arnulf treated the claims of Berengar and Lambert with impartial contempt. Every city and castle hastened to tender their submission. Though Italy's best allies, disease and pestilence, had

<sup>1</sup> The siege is described in the poem concerning Berengar. Neither the churches, nor the sacred virgins, nor the priests, whose hands were wont to be kissed after the celebration of the mass, were respected :

<sup>m</sup> *Ecce verenda prius nullo sub honore tenentur  
Atria, nam scissis pereunt velamina vittis  
Virgins, impulsusque sacer fugit ipse minister,  
Quorundam stringunt ambas quæ vincula palmas,  
Oscula quæ solitæ sacris sentire litatis.*  
—iii. p. 397.

<sup>n</sup> Anonym. Salernit. I follow Muratori in the sequence and dates of these events.

<sup>o</sup> The prayers of the clergy, according to Berengar's panegyrist, had hastened Guido's death.—iii. p. 399.

<sup>p</sup> “De ipso Lamberto, patris se curam habere, filique carissimi loco eum diligere, atque inviolabilem cum eo concordiam se velle servare.”—Frodoard Hist. Rom.

<sup>p</sup> During this year Arnulf had shown himself a faithful son of the Church, at the Council of Tribur, in which he had confirmed the power and privileges of the clergy, and recognised the supremacy of Rome.

already begun again to weaken the German army, and gathering movements in the north under Berengar threatened to cut off the retreat to the Alps, he reached the gates of Rome at the earnest supplication of Formosus the captive of his subjects.<sup>1</sup> There the faction adverse to the Pope Formosus had gained the mastery. They had the boldness, and imagined that they had strength to resist. Preparations were made for defence. Arnulf moved with his whole army to the siege of the imperial city, to the release of the Pope. A trivial accident betrayed Rome into his hands. A hare startled by the noise ran towards the city, followed by a hooting multitude. The Romans mistook this for a general assault, were seized with a panic, and many threw themselves over the walls. The Leonine quarter was easily taken; the whole city submitted to the conqueror. The first act of the ally and deliverer of the Pope was publicly to behead the chiefs of the opposite faction. The first act of the grateful Formosus was the coronation of Arnulf as emperor. He declared null, as extorted by compulsion, the inauguration of Lambert. The next day the people were summoned to take the oath of allegiance to the Emperor. The oath was in these words: "I swear by these holy mysteries, that, saving my honour, my law, and the fidelity I owe to my Lord the Pope Formosus, I both am and will be faithful all my life to the Emperor Arnulf; that I will never assist Lambert the son of Ageltruda, nor Ageltruda herself, nor be accessory to the surrender of the city to either of them, or to their followers."

Sept. 895.  
Arnulf again  
in Italy.  
In Rome.

April, 896.  
Coronation of  
Arnulf by  
Formosus.

Arnulf ventured to remain in Rome no more than fifteen days. He left Farold, one of his great vassals, as governor and protector of the city. He marched towards Spoleto, where Ageltruda, the widow of Guido, had taken refuge. As he approached that city, he was seized with a paralytic disorder, attributed to poison administered to him by a servant of Ageltruda. Already was this crime

<sup>1</sup> Liutprand, i. 8. "A Romanis vehementer afflictabatur."—Hermann. Contract. in Chronic.

in Italy the suspected cause of every sudden death or dangerous malady. He hastened almost as a fugitive to Germany. Though of the German party, Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona, sees the hand of God in this shameful flight of Arnulf. The Italian hatred of the German breaks through even party feeling. "Not merely did Arnulf assume all the glory of his victories to himself, instead of referring them to God, but the conduct of his troops demanded the divine vengeance. Priests were led about in chains; nuns violated; even the churches were no asyla; the soldiers held their profane orgies, performed their shameless acts, sang their ribald songs, indulged in the open prostitution of women, within the consecrated walls."

Before Arnulf had crossed the Alps, the Pope Formosus had died; all Italy had risen; the two factions of Berengar and Lambert were equally hostile to the Germans. Arnulf's governor in Rome seems to have exercised no influence in the election of the Pope, which was carried at once by the opposite party. The choice fell on Boniface VII. The new pontiff laboured under the imputation of having been twice deposed for his profligate and scandalous life, first from the subdiaconate, afterwards from the priesthood. Boniface died of the gout fifteen days after his elevation. The Italian party hastened to the election of Stephen VI. Probably the German governor had withdrawn before Stephen and his faction proceeded to wreak their vengeance on the lifeless remains of Formosus.\* Fierce political animosity took the form of ecclesiastical solemnity. The body was disinterred, dressed in the papal habiliments, and, before a council assembled for the purpose, addressed in these words: "Wherefore wert thou, being Bishop of Porto, tempted by ambition to usurp the Catholic see of Rome?" The deacon who had been assigned as counsel for the dead maintained a prudent silence. The sacred

Death of  
Formosus,  
May 23, 896.

Boniface VII.

June 6, 896.  
Stephen VI.

\* Liutprand attributes the violation of the tomb of Formosus to Sergius, his former rival: he must be corrected by the acts of the Council of Rome under John IX.—Labbe, p. 502.

vestments were then stripped from the body, three of the fingers cut off, the body cast into the Tiber. All who had been ordained by Formosus were re-ordained by Stephen. Such, however, were the vicissitudes of popular feeling in Rome, that some years after a miracle was said to have asserted the innocence of Formosus. His body was found by fishermen in the Tiber, and carried back for burial in the church of St. Peter. As the coffin passed, all the images in the church reverentially bowed their heads.\*

The pontificate of Stephen soon came to an end. A new revolution revenged the disinterment of the insulted prelate; and now the fierceness of political, rather than religious faction, had utterly destroyed all reverence for the sacred person of the Pope. Stephen was thrown into prison by his enemies, and strangled.† The convenient charge of usurpation, always brought against the Popes whom their adversaries dethroned or put to death, may have reconciled their minds to the impious deed, but it is difficult to discover in what respect the title of Pope Stephen VI. was defective.

Pope now succeeded Pope with such rapidity as to awaken the inevitable suspicion, either that those were chosen who were likely to make a speedy vacancy, or they received but a fatal gift in the pontificate of Rome. Romanus and Theodorus II. survived their promotion each only a few months.‡ The latter, by his restoration of Formosus to the rights of Christian burial, and by his reversal of the acts of Stephen VI., may be presumed to have belonged to that faction. The next election was contested with all the strength and violence of the adverse parties. John IX. was successful; his competitor, Ser-

\* "Hoc namque a religiosissimis Romanis persæpe audiui."—Liutprand.

† See Flodoard, and the epitaph on Stephen, found in the time of Alexander III. After stating that "reputet Formosi spurca superbi crimina," it says—

"Captus et a sede pulsus ad ima fuit  
Carceris interea vinculis constrictus, et uno  
Strangulatus nervo, exiit et hominem."

‡ A.D. 897, Romanus, July, Nov.

"Quatuor haud plenos tractans in culmine menses." Flodoard.

Theodorus II., Nov. Dec. Flodoard says that he sat only twenty days. Some months must have slipped out. Theodorus had time to reverse the decrees of Stephen, and solemnly to reinter Formosus. Theodorus seems to have aimed at reconciling the parties.

"Hic populum docuit connectere vincula pacis  
Atque sacerdotes concordi junxit honor." Flodoard.

gius, according to some accounts formerly the discomfited competitor of Formosus, and his bitter and implacable enemy, fled to the powerful protection of the Marquis of Tuscany.\*

John IX. was not content with the replacement of the remains of Formosus in the sacred quiet of the tomb. He determined to crush the opposing party by the decree of a Council. This Council—for the dominant assembly was always a Council (that of which the decrees were to be revoked was degraded to a synod)—annulled at once the unprecedented judgment passed on a dead body; it excused those who were present at that synod, as acting under compulsion, and severely condemned all who should use such violence against the clergy. It declared that the translation of Formosus from another see, though justified by necessity in his case, was not to be drawn into a precedent. The orders which he had bestowed were confirmed, the re-ordinations condemned. It sentenced the decrees of that synod to be burned. But though John IX. was thus avowedly of the party of Formosus, he found it expedient to submit to the Italian Emperor. The title of Lambert was fully recognised at Rome: the coronation of the Barbarian Arnulf<sup>7</sup> rejected with scorn. The secret of this apostacy was the utter extinction of the German party. Arnulf, by his flight, had become contemptible to the whole of Italy; and he was known to be dying of a slow disease. The Council endeavoured to secure the more peaceful election and consecration of the Popes. The people were to demand, the bishops and clergy to elect, and immediately to consecrate in the presence of the Imperial Legates. No oaths or promises were to be extorted from a new Pope, except those sanctioned by

\* In the strange confusion which prevails throughout this period, it is doubtful whether this election of Sergius and his flight to the court of Tuscany did take place on two occasions, or whether the first is not an anticipation of the event which now took place.

<sup>6</sup> Pellitur urbe pater, pervadit sacra Joannes, Romuloque greges dissipat ipse lupus."

So writes the hostile author of the Epitaphium Sergii apud Pagi. The more friendly Flodoard—

"Joannes scilicet hic qui fuit in ordine nonus, Pellitur electus patriâ quo Sergius urbe, Romulidumque gregum quidam traduntur abacti."

<sup>7</sup> Jaffé must be right in reading Arnulfi for Berengarii. Regesta, p. 304.

ancient custom. Another canon prohibited the strange practice, which nevertheless long defied all authority of law, the right of plundering the Pope's palace immediately on his decease.

Nor did Pope John IX. lose the opportunity of condemning his rival, Sergius, by the authority of a Council. He was excommunicated, with several other priests and inferior clergy, as accessory to the insults against the body of Formosus. Sergius laughed to scorn the thunders of his rival, so long as he was under the protection of the powerful House of Tuscany.

With John IX. closed the ninth century of Christianity; the tenth, in Italy at least, the iron age had already darkened upon Rome; the Pontificate had been won by crime and vacated by murder.

Died July,  
A.D. 901.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## CONVERSION OF BULGARIA.

YET in remoter regions, even during the ninth century, Christianity was gathering in nations of converts. Formosus. One, indeed, who is deeply involved in the fierce contests, loaded with the heaviest charges of guilt, struck by the condemning thunderbolts of the Church, after a short period of hard-won power as Pope, dragged from his grave, insulted, then restored and canonised ; thus at once a leading actor and the victim in these fatal feuds, the Pope Formosus, is described, by a poetical panegyrist, as the Apostle of the Bulgarians, the destroyer of their temples, as having endured many perils in order to subdue them to the faith.<sup>a</sup> The perils of Formosus as a missionary are the embellishments of the poet.<sup>b</sup> Formosus went into Bulgaria as a legate from Pope Nicolas, some time after the conversion of the King, in order to complete the Christianisation of the people, and to correct the errors which they had learned from their first teachers, the Greeks.

The name of the Bulgarians, a race, next to the Huns, the most terrible and most hateful to the invaded The Bulgarians. Europeans, was known in the West as early as the reign of Theodoric the Ostrogoth.<sup>c</sup> Their Asiatic residence had been on the shores of the Volga ; it is disputed whether the river took its name from the people, or the people from the river. In Europe, either mingled with, or bordering upon the Sclavonians, they spread over a large tract of territory, from the shores of the Palus Mæotis and the

<sup>a</sup> " Præsul hic egregius Formosus laudibus  
alter  
Evehitur, castus, parvus sibi, largus egenis,  
Bulgaris genti fidei qui semina sparsit,  
Delubra destruxit, populum cælestibus armis  
instruxit, tolerans discrimina plurima."  
*Flodoard, apud Mabillon,*  
Sæcl. iii. Benedict.

<sup>b</sup> Anastasius in Vit. Formosi.

<sup>c</sup> Eunod. Panegyric, in the sixth century. Pope John VIII., with the total ignorance of history not uncommon, asserts that the Bulgarians had been under the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff since the time of Pope Damasus. — Epist. lxxviii.

Euxine, along the course of the Lower Danube. While the Teutonic tribes had gradually yielded to the mild yoke of Christianity (the fierce Northmen alone, who poured forth in their piratical vessels from the lakes and the havens on the Baltic and the German Ocean, still remaining heathen), for three centuries no impression seems to have been made on the Bulgarians or the Sclavonians, who occupied the north-eastern frontier of the Empire. They were still rude, warlike, and chiefly pastoral tribes, inaccessible alike to the civilisation and the religion of Rome. The Eastern Empire had neither a Charlemagne, to compel by force of arms, nor zealous monkish missionaries, like those of Germany, to penetrate the vast plains and spreading morasses of the re-barbarised province on either side of the Danube; to found abbasies and bishoprics, to cultivate the soil, and reclaim the people.

The first establishment of Christianity in Bulgaria took place in the ninth century. There is a strange <sup>First conversion.</sup> uniformity in the instruments employed in the conversion of barbarous Princes, and through the Princes of their barbarous subjects. A female of rank and influence, a zealous monk, some fearful national calamity; no sooner do these three agencies coincide, than the heathen land opens itself to Christianity.<sup>d</sup>

The sister of Bogoris, the King of Bulgaria, had fallen in her childhood into the hands of the Greek <sup>A.D. 863, 864.</sup> Emperor; she had been a captive for thirty-eight years, and had been educated at Constantinople in the Christian faith. A monk, Theodosius Cupharas, had been long a bond slave in Bulgaria. During certain negotiations to avert war between the Empress Theodora and the Bulgarian King, an exchange was proposed of the captive Princess for the learned monk. If the monk had made any impression on the Barbarian Monarch, the gentle importunity of his sister still more favourably disposed him to the cause of Christ. A pestilence ravaged Bulgaria; and with that facility with which all polytheists try the powers of conflicting deities, Bogoris did not scruple to adore the God of his sister. The plague was stayed; the King

<sup>d</sup> Theophanes, Chronograph.

acknowledged the might and the goodness of the Christian's God, but feared to encounter the more bigoted and obstinate Paganism of his subjects. He chose a singular method to undermine their prejudice. There were two monks from Constantinople, sons of Leo of Thessalonica, distinguished for holiness, zeal, and learning; Cyril, his proper name was Constantine, was skilled in the Greek, Latin, Sclavonian, Armenian, and Khasarian languages. The other, Methodius, was a monk, whose skill in painting had excited the wonder of the Barbarians. By the intelligible preaching of this wonderful art, King Bogoris hoped to familiarise men's minds with the tenets of the Gospel.<sup>e</sup> But he knew his people; images of terror alone would touch their savage hearts. By his advice, Methodius painted the Last Judgment; he represented the punishment of the damned with all the horrors his imagination could suggest, or his pencil execute. The King shuddered at the awful spectacle by which he had thought to alarm others: he earnestly solicited Theodora for a priest to unite him to those sons of the Church who could alone hope for escape from that horrible destiny. The image-worshipping Empress, delighted at once with the progress of Christianity, and this testimony to the power of painting, lost no time in despatching a Bishop on this important mission. But the nobles of Bulgaria, and the mass of the people, were unmoved by the terrors which agitated the inmost soul of the King. The ceremony of the royal baptism could only be ventured under the veil of darkness; and no sooner had the secret transpired, than a formidable insurrection broke out in favour of the national gods. The rebels invested the palace, threatened the King with death, and were prepared to raise a new sovereign to the throne.<sup>f</sup> But the faith of Bogoris was firm; he marched out to meet his revolted subjects with the cross upon his breast, and with only forty-eight attendants. At the sight of the courageous monarch, a sudden panic seized the insurgents; they fled on all sides. The King's vengeance showed no great progress in Christian humanity; he put

<sup>e</sup> Cedren. Hist. l. 2, p. 152. Symeon Logothet. apud Theophan. Contin. p. 664. Zonaras.

<sup>f</sup> Nicol. I. Respons. xvii.

to death all the insurgent nobles, with their families, not sparing an infant. To the lower orders his clemency granted a general amnesty.

Constantine, who is better known under his name of Cyril, who had been long employed in the conversion of the Khazars, on the north shore of the Euxine, was now sent by the Empress Theodora to complete the conversion of the people. Cyril spent some time in the country, and then passed on to the spiritual conquest of Moravia.

But the King of Bulgaria, either from the ardent interest which his new religion had awakened in his mind, or with political objects, aspired to enter into relations with Western Christendom. The fame of the Pope, and his acknowledged supremacy in the West, as well as his claim to be the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ throughout the world, had reached the fervent proselyte. The brother of the King appeared in Rome to request the advice of the Pope on matters which perplexed the yet uninstructed faith of the barbarous nation. The contempt and hatred of the Bulgarians for the Greeks may have led them to suspect the purity of faith derived from that quarter. The quarrel for the See of Constantinople between Ignatius and Photius was at its height: and this suspicion may have been deepened by the well-timed or accidental visits of Latin missionaries. Hence the Bulgarians may have determined to have their Christianity from the highest authority.

The 106 questions submitted to the Pope by the King of Bulgaria, embrace every point of ecclesiastical discipline, of ceremonial observance, and of manners.

The Pope was Nicolas I., a prelate, whose name might well have spread into the remotest regions, with all the awfulness which belonged to a supreme pontiff. Nicolas replied to these questions in a tone mild, Christian, and parental, except towards apostates to heathenism. His answers tend in general with wise discretion to mitigate the ferocity of a savage nation.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> "Veruntamen absit a mentibus vestris, ut tam impiè jam judicetis, qui tam pium Deum et dominum agnovistis; præsertim cum magis oporteat ut, sicut hactenus ad mortem facile quosque per-

traxistis, ita deinceps non ad mortem, sed ad vitam quos potestis nihilominus perducatis."—No. xxv., Labbe, Concil., p. 527.

The King of Bulgaria is gently reminded that he has adopted the worship of a more merciful God; that the careless and Eastern prodigality with which he was accustomed to sacrifice human life was inconsistent with his new faith. The conscience of Bogoris was haunted by compunction for the massacre of his nobles. The Pope censures the cruelty, which involved the innocent children in the crime of their fathers; the massacre, as executed from zeal towards God, might be atoned for by penance. Nicolas should perhaps not be harshly judged for this leniency towards a passed and irrevocable act of barbarity, perpetrated under such circumstances. Apostates from the faith, who refuse to listen to the admonitions of their spiritual fathers, are to receive no toleration from the government,<sup>b</sup> but those without the Church God alone will judge. The simple people had inquired whether it was lawful to pray for their fathers who had died in unbelief; the Pope sternly prohibits this vain mark of filial affection. He could not, even if he would, mitigate the damnation of their fathers without weakening one of the most effective arguments for their conversion. But no violence was to be used against those who continued to worship idols, only all communion was to be avoided with them. The power which Nicolas demanded for the clergy was, in some degree, no doubt intended to soften the barbarity of the people.<sup>c</sup> The laws were to take their course against all ordinary crimes; but even the adulterer, the murderer, the parricide, if he could reach the asylum of the Church, was under the protection of the Bishop, and to be judged by his milder judgment. Torture for the purpose of obtaining evidence is strongly prohibited.<sup>m</sup>

The Pope did not attempt to extinguish the passion for war in a people like the Bulgarians, even if he had any sense of its incongruity with the Gospel. They were to

<sup>b</sup> xviii. xlii.

<sup>c</sup> Awe of the priesthood was a first element of their Christianity. A Greek, pretending to be a priest, had profanely baptised many Bulgarians. The king, having detected him *by the inspiration of God*, had ordered him to have his nose

and ears cut off, to be severely scourged, and expelled the kingdom. The Pope reproves the inhumanity of this punishment, and admits all the baptisms as valid.—No. lxxxvi. viii.

<sup>m</sup> No. xiv. xv. No. lxxxvi.

go to battle no longer under their old national ensign, the horse-tail, but under the banner of the Cross. On the question whether they were to refrain from going out to battle on holy days, he is guarded, and allows large discretion for cases of necessity. Instead of observing fortunate days and hours before they went to war, and using enchantments, sports, plays,<sup>n</sup> songs, and auguries, they were to go to the Church, to make offerings, to confess to the priests, and to perform such acts of charity as opening the prisons, emancipating slaves, and almsgiving to the poor. They had a stern but, no doubt for discipline, very effective usage, that before battle some tried warrior inspected the arms and the horse of each soldier; where they were found neglected or unfit for use, he put the offender to death. The Pope ingeniously suggests that greater attention should be paid to the spiritual preparation of the soldier.<sup>o</sup>

On the ancient superstitions and manners of these barbarians these questions are less particular than will satisfy the curious inquirer. The king was accustomed to eat alone, not even his wife might sit down in his presence.<sup>p</sup> The Pope gently persuades to a more sociable and humble demeanour, alleging the example of the Son of God, who condescended to eat with his disciples. The warlike people were accustomed to administer their oaths on a sword driven into the earth as the most sacred symbol. The Pope commands them to substitute the Holy Gospels.

Polygamy he strictly forbids; whoever, according to the ancient usages of the people, had two wives, was to confine himself to the first.<sup>q</sup> Marriage within the prohibited degrees is interdicted, and spiritual consanguinity is declared to be equally close with that of blood: inter-marriage with a godfather or his offspring is as incestuous

<sup>n</sup> What were these *joci*? war dances, or ludicrous exhibitions of dwarfs and buffoons, such as delight savages? The Pope afterwards, in condescension to the weakness of their faith, permits such amusements, except during Lent.—No. xlvii. No. xxxiii. iv.

<sup>o</sup> Nicolas quotes Ps. xxxiii. 17, and Prov. xxi. 31. "The horse is prepared

against the day of battle, but safety is of the Lord."

<sup>p</sup> No. xliii.

<sup>q</sup> There was a singular question, whether after conversion they were bound to wear breeches (*femoralia*). The Pope answers that religion has nothing to do with their ordinary dress; and extricates himself by giving the question a spiritual turn.—lix.

as with an actual parent or kindred. The Pope delights in condemning some minute and superstitious usages enjoined by the Greeks in the marriage ceremonial, and in the observance of Lent; his rule is of course that of the Roman Church. Nicolas sums up the whole with a solemn warning against the errors of the Greeks and Armenians, and earnestly persuades adherence to the one immaculate Church, that of Rome.\*

The allegiance of the Bulgarian Church to the Patriarch of Constantinople or to the successor of St. Peter was an object of contest during several centuries. Each could adduce evidence of voluntary submission on the part of the Bulgarians, the Greek the commencement, the Latin the completion of the conversion. The Popes rested their claim not solely on their universal supremacy, but on that of the Archbishop of Thessalonica, to whose jurisdiction the province belonged, and who, as an Illyrian Metropolitan, was asserted to be under ancient subordination to Rome. The strife endured through the papacy of Nicolas and Hadrian II. Many angry and some expostulatory letters appear among those of John VIII. to Paul Bishop of Thessalonica: and during his own papacy Formosus steadily urged the work of conversion. The King Michael (such was the baptismal name of the Barbarian Bogoris after the Emperor of the East) must have been perplexed to hear that he had only learned error and heresy from his Greek teachers, that he was no Christian worshipper, but a blasphemer.\* It might even have been worse. Would he have embraced the Christianity of Constantinople when that city held Arian or Macedonian doctrines? If he had so done, he would have become a convert only to perish with his teachers in everlasting fire. The only security was in the irreprehensible Church of Rome. Ignatius was Patriarch of Constantinople when the Greek Bishops were warned to withdraw from the

\* A more memorable question is what they are to do with certain profane books which they had taken from the Saracens (where and at what period does not appear). The reply of the Pope is in the true spirit of Amrou, "Let them be

burned."—No. ciii.

\* Joann. viii. Epist. lxxv. et seq. See on the other side the letter of Photius; a full defence of the Greek points of difference. Epist. l.

spiritual territory of Rome. But even Ignatius, though bound by his interests and gratitude to the unshaken supporter of his claims to the Patriarchate against the usurper Photius, would not surrender the rights of his Church over the Bulgarians. Ignatius, the Holy Patriarch of Constantinople, became almost as odious at Rome as his exiled rival Photius. This contumacy contributed to throw the Pope, contrary to the policy of his predecessors, and to the indignation of the West, which has been perpetuated by later writers, on the side of Photius. The hopes of the surrender of the Bulgarian provinces was among the temptations which induced John VIII. to acknowledge the title of Photius. Centuries did not reconcile the strife.

The Greek missionaries in the meantime, Methodius and Cyril, were passing on to new Christian conquests. The wars of Charlemagne had disseminated some compulsory Christianity among certain of the Slavian tribes. Other partial attempts had been made, especially by the Archbishop of Salzburg.

Radislav, the Prince of Moravia, standing in need of a political alliance with the Emperor Michael, readily admitted these indefatigable monks into his kingdom. Before long the king, his brother, and the people were baptised, a church was built in honour of the Virgin Mary at Wilibrad,<sup>1</sup> and the Christian priests were held in such high respect by the nation that they were called by the name of Princes.<sup>2</sup>

Christianity brought other gifts in her train. The Slavian dialects were as yet unwritten: their alphabet was the invention of Cyril.<sup>3</sup> This pious man and his colleagues not only so far mastered the language as to preach with success; they translated, it is said, the Bible, probably certain books of the Scripture, into the dialect of Moravia, and even ventured to celebrate the services of the Church in that tongue. This great question as to the celebration

<sup>1</sup> Wilibrad, now Hradisch.—Palacky, i. p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> The church of Olmutz boasted higher antiquity; it was *rebuilt* by King Radislav and Cyril.

<sup>3</sup> The Pope (John VIII.) ascribes the invention of the Slavian alphabet to Constantine the *philosopher* (Cyril), as if his philosophy had been called into use in this good work.

of the Liturgy in the vulgar tongue of those barbarous nations who might embrace the faith, had raised no jealousy in the East, where Greek was so widely spoken. The translation of the Bible into the Mæsothotic by Ulphilas had been hailed as a triumph of the faith.

Except perhaps among the Anglo-Saxons of Britain and the remoter parts of Germany, which were subdued to Christianity by the sword of Charlemagne, throughout Western Christendom a large part of the population was Roman, or provincials who spoke Latin. At first the clergy continued to be of Roman descent. New languages were forming in Italy, Spain, and Gaul on a Latin groundwork; the Latin services of the Church, therefore, ceased, only gradually and partially, to be intelligible to the common ear. No doubt the constant repetition of these services in the Church contributed to give the Latin element the predominance in these mingled languages; and the transition was so irregular and imperceptible that there would be no precise time at which the sacred Latin would be called upon to abdicate its immemorial use as the Liturgical language. The Church could follow with difficulty, even in her popular preaching, these shifting and unsettled forms of speech.<sup>7</sup> Even in the more Teutonic parts of Germany, though the German language, in its various dialects, was beginning to sever Germany from France, the Latin and German or Theotisc oath taken at the treaty of Strasburg, the Latin by Charles, the German by Louis, was at once the sign and the commencement of the estrangement and future oppugnancy of the Latin and Teutonic. Still even in German Germany Latin had already gained and strove to maintain, through the clergy, its sacred and venerable character.

But among the Slavian tribes the Greek missionaries had penetrated into regions of unmingled Barbarism, where

<sup>7</sup> Charlemagne ordered Paulus Diaconus (in 782) to make a collection of his Latin sermons for his whole realm. Successive Councils—at Arles (Can. x.) and Tours (Can. iv. xvii.), as well as Rheims (xiv. xv.) and Mentz (xxv.)—commanded preaching in German as well as in Latin. The Heliand, the

Muspelli, and still earlier poetic versions or paraphrases of Scripture, are of the reign of Louis the Pious and of his sons. — Gfrörer *die Karolinger*, i. 66. The subject will be resumed. The author of the *Chronicon Salernitanum* (written in Lower Italy) speaks of the "*Lingua Tedesca quod olim Longobardi loquebantur.*"

the mass of the people were entirely unacquainted with either of the two great languages of the Roman Empire. Rome by some untraced connection which had grown up between these Greek missionaries in Slavonia and the Roman See (the monks were probably image-worshippers, and so refused obedience to Iconoclastic Constantinople)\* was called upon to decide this important question. The missionaries Methodius and Cyril, who were supposed guilty of propagating the fatal errors of the Greeks in Bulgaria, appear in Rome as the recognised apostles of the Slaves. They brought the welcome offering of the relics of Clement, the successor of St. Peter, which Cyril boasted to have found on the barbarous shores of the Euxine. Their creed was examined, declared unimpeachable. Cyril died in Rome. Methodius was acknowledged as Archbishop of Moravia and returned with that title to his diocese. According to one account, somewhat legendary in its tone, at an early period under Nicolas I. and his successor Hadrian an amicable discussion took place, and Cyril by a triumphant inference from the words of the Psalm, "Let every spirit praise the Lord," (and if every spirit should praise the Lord, why are not the praises of the Lord in the mass and the canonical prayers to be sung in the Slavian tongue?) overcame the scruples of the Pope.

The controversy was renewed during the pontificate of John VIII. The Pope at first prohibited this departure from ancient usage, this desecration of the Church services by their celebration in a barbarous tongue.\* Methodius, the Archbishop of Moravia, again appeared in Rome. He was received with the utmost respect. Again his creed was pronounced unimpeachable, his labours honoured with the highest praise,<sup>b</sup> and the Pope declared that God had made other languages besides the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin; that it was not inconsistent with sound doctrine to sing the mass or to read the Gospel in the Slavian language. As a mark of respect, the service and the Gospel were first to be read in Latin, and then translated for the use of those who were ignorant of that language.<sup>c</sup>

\* Methodius, it must be remembered, was a Painter.

<sup>a</sup> Epist. xcvi.

<sup>b</sup> A.D. 880.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. cxlvii.

From Moravia Christianity spread into the neighbouring Slavian principality of Bohemia. The Prince Borimoz and his wife, afterwards the Sainted Ludmila, were admitted to baptism. Swatopluk, who valiantly, if not without perfidy, had thrown off the German yoke, and vindicated the liberties of Moravia, had married a Bohemian princess, sister of Borimoz. The patriotic historian rejects as an unworthy fable that, so long as the Bohemian was a Pagan the Christian Swatopluk would only permit her to sit at a lower table in the banquet; he rejects also a rebellion of the Bohemian subjects of Borimoz in favour of their native gods. Ludmila outlived her two sons, successively Princes of Bohemia;<sup>d</sup> but she had watched with more than a mother's care, a Christian mother's, the growth of her nephew Wenzel, under whose reign Christianity won the complete conquest of Bohemia, and who died not indeed by a brother's hand but by a brother's guilt, with the beauty of a martyr's death, if not absolutely as a martyr for the faith. Wenzel built churches in every city of the realm; God, says the legend, had given him such grace, that he could understand Latin books like a good Bishop, and could read Slavian without difficulty. He fulfilled all the works of faith, fed and clothed the poor, protected widows and orphans, redeemed bond-slaves, especially priests, exercised hospitality to strangers; gentle and full of love to the high and to the low, his only care was the well-being of all. But the fierce Bohemian nobles hated the mild and peaceful Wenzel; his brother Boleslaw was at the head of a conspiracy; he attempted to assassinate the king with his own hand; the stronger Wenzel struck him down, "God forgive thee, my brother," but he did not strike again. Wenzel was despatched by the other conspirators.

But Wenzel's work was done; Christianity remained the religion of Bohemia; Wenzel was worshipped by the people; he became the tutelar Saint of the land.\*

<sup>d</sup> Compare Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, i. p. 133.

\* Palacky, 210.

## CHAPTER IX.

## THE NORTHMEN.

THE ninth century beheld also the invasion of the remoter North by Christian zeal. The intrepid missionaries penetrated into those regions which were pouring forth their swarms of pirates on all the coasts of Europe. They sought the Northmen among their own dark pine forests, their blue fiords, and icy lakes. They crossed the Baltic and assailed the last retreat of the old Teutonic divinities, where the faith appeared in its fullest mythological character, in Scandinavia.

The tide of barbaric invasion, which had been thrown back by Charlemagne, began to pour again in a different course over Western Christendom. It was no longer vast hosts, or whole nations moving in masses upon the frontiers, entire tribes crossing the Elbe, the Rhine, and the Danube, and either retiring with their plunder or forming settlements within the territory of the Empire; it was by sea, and on every coast from the British Ocean round to the Adriatic, that the heathen Northmen on one side, the Saracens on the other, threatened the conquest of Christian Europe. The Saracens contested or had won the command of the Mediterranean; all along the south they had ravaged or formed settlements. Sicily was almost entirely Saracen; and they have been seen advancing along Italy even to the gates of Rome: a mosque threatens to rise on the ruins of St. Peter's. In the next century, from a settlement in the province of Genoa, they infested the passes of the Alps; murdered many passing English pilgrims in the defiles; even reached Genoa in search of plunder.\* The Northmen in the mean time were wasting the whole of Northern Europe. From the shores of the Baltic, from the Scandinavian islands, from the gulphs and lakes, their fleets

\* Flodoard.

sailed on, wherever the tide or the tempest might drive them. They seemed to defy, in their ill-formed barks, the wildest weather; to be able to land on the most inaccessible shores, to find their way up the narrowest creeks and shallowest rivers; nothing was secure, not even in the heart of the country, from the sudden appearance of these relentless ravagers. The invasion of the piratical Northmen had disturbed the declining years of Charlemagne himself; that sagacious king had seen their approach with prescient terror. His wise policy had planned the only sure defence against such enemies—the building and keeping afloat a powerful fleet, the erection of strong forts, with garrisons, at the mouths of the rivers. But during the reigns of his imbecile and disunited successors, these precautions were utterly neglected. They had not an armed ship on the seas, and not a standing troop of soldiers; the desultory forces which they raised dispersed immediately the campaign was over. Year after year these plundering expeditions were becoming more incessant, more ubiquitous. Not a province in any of the kingdoms, hardly a city in the most inland district escaped these terrible visitants.<sup>b</sup> The civil wars which still continued throughout these disastrous years, with the gradual decline of the warlike nobility, and the absorption of the great fiefs by the churches and the monasteries, yielded up the country almost defenceless to the merciless invader. The great feudatories, the descendants of the Frankish chieftains who had conquered Gaul, and received large grants of land, were rapidly dying out. When most needed to head their hardy vassals, they had either perished in the strife between the different branches of the feeble and hostile Carolingians, or had retired into the cloister. Instead of bequeathing a noble estate, with strongly fortified castles, and a hardy band of followers, the Baron had alienated it to the all-absorbing church, and for the stronghold a peaceful and defenceless monastery had arisen. At the fatal battle of Fontenoy, were said to have

<sup>b</sup> There is no necessity, with Gfrörer, sons of Louis the Pious to invade each other's dominions. Gfrörer is again too keen-sighted, to suppose that the Normans were hired or urged by the hostile

fallen 100,000 men. The poet, the historian, describe Fontenet as yielding up the defenceless realm to the Normans.<sup>c</sup> That very year, Osker, the Norman, warped up the Seine, burned Rouen; in his descent, burned the rich abbey of Jumièges. Fontenelle bought its security at a high price.<sup>d</sup> From that time every river of France was darkened with the black sails of the Normans. They sailed up the Somme—Abbeville, Amiens, all Picardy lay waste. Again they sailed up the Seine—Rouen, Paris, were in the power of the ferocious Regnar Lodbrok. They were in the Loire—Nantes, Orleans, Blois, Tours (once saved, it was believed, by the all-powerful relics of St. Martin), had been saved only to fall on the next assault into more terrible ruin: Angers, Chartres, were burned. They struck inland to Bourges, to Clermont. They were in the Garonne—Bordeaux, Toulouse, Saintonge, Auch, Limoges, Poitiers, Tarbes, were in flames. It is an appalling and significant fact that the Pope consented to transfer the useless Archbishopric of Bordeaux to Bourges, even though Bourges, in the heart of the land, had not been secure. They followed the coasts of Spain. They ran up the Groyne, the Tagus, the Guadalquiver. In the south of Spain they encountered the Saracens: near Seville met the fleets of the worshippers of Odin and the followers of Mohammed. The Arabic chronicles are not silent on the descents of these new unbelievers. They roved along the Mediterranean; they forced their way against the stream of the rapid Rhone. Arles, Nismes, even Vienne, suffered the inevitable fate of conflagration and pillage. One adventurous band had heard some vague rumours of Rome, of her vast wealth.<sup>e</sup> They sailed across; mistook the Magra for the Tiber; landed near the fine old Etruscan city of Luna. The Bishop

\* According to the Ravennese biographer, 40,000 fell on the side of Lothair alone.

"La perit de France la flor,  
Et des Barons tuit le meillor,  
Ainsi trovrent Palens terre  
Vuide de gens, bonne a conquerre."

*Wace. Roman de Rou.* l. p. 16.

"Totam Franciam, militum præsidio nudam, cujus robur in bello Fontanido

nuper deperierat, tantus metus corripuerat, ut Normannis nemo possit resistere, nemo possit repellere."—Fragm. Historic. Duchesne, Script. Num. iii. p. 334. See other quotations in Depping, *Histoire des Normands*, p. 68; Eginhard, Vit. Car. p. 452.

<sup>d</sup> See Sir F. Palgrave's picturesque description of this expedition, p. 322.

<sup>e</sup> Depping, ii. 2, p. 80.

and his clergy were celebrating mass on Christmas day, when they heard of these unknown strangers; they received them with courteous Christian hospitality. Hasting, the famous leader, submitted to baptism. Ere long the Norman camp rang with shrieks of sorrow—Hasting was dead. Some nights after they entreated sepulture for Hasting in the holy cloister. The great captain was borne amid his weeping followers to the grave. As they were about to lower the bier, up sprang the dead man, and cut the bishop to the earth. The priests were massacred; the city plundered; all the wealth of Luna, her beautiful women, and all her youths who could run, were swept on board the fleet. So ran the Norman legend. Italian history has preserved a fragmentary record of this wild event.<sup>1</sup> Pisa too is said to have been surprised and sacked.

Germany was not more secure. Very early the Scheldt, the Wahl, the Lys, had been made high-roads to the mercantile cities of Flanders. Year after year, Utrecht, Antwerp, Ghent, Courtray, were pillaged. The broad Rhine was too tempting a road. Nimeguen, Cologne, Bonn, Coblenz, Bingen, even as far as Worms, opened their gates, or had their gates beaten down by the irresistible pirates. Mentz alone seems to have been secure behind her strong walls. On their descent, they sacked Treves. Archbishop Hincmar fled with the reliques of St. Remi, from Rheims: he fled to die in terror and obscurity. From some unknown cause the adventurers did not penetrate into Rheims, though they plundered all the monasteries around; but in Aix-la-Chapelle the barbarous Normans pitched their camp in the palace courts of Charlemagne. Charlemagne's descendants submitted year after year to ignominious capitulations; the peace which they could not win, which they rarely strove to win, with the sword, was bought by large sums of money. Charles the Bald, Louis the German, each of the conflicting kings, who called themselves the sovereigns

<sup>1</sup> Depping, 112. "*Luna civitas a Normannis dolo capta.*"—Fragm. Chronic.; Muratori, Ant. Ital. i. 25. "*La città di Luni fu disfatta per gente ultramontane.*"—Villani.

of the empire, paid in turn this ruinous and disgraceful tribute.

The Northmen were heathens ; their ferocious religion no doubt exasperated their natural ferocity ; their gods, like themselves, were warriors and pirates. But they did not, like the Saracens, wage a religious war. Providentially these Arabs of the sea had no Mohammed to organise the Scandinavian tribes into one vast host ; to give them the unity and force of a new Northern Caliphate. They had no ambition to propagate their faith : perhaps they would have been unwilling to share with others the protection of their warlike gods ; they had rather that their enemies should believe in a milder religion, which yielded them up unresisting, or feebly resisting to the plunderer or the conqueror. They destroyed, with indifferent ferocity, the church and the castle ; their indiscriminate rapacity plundered alike the monastery or the farm ; they massacred with as little remorse the bishop or the monk, as the Count or his vassal. If their chief ravages appear to have been made upon religious edifices or estates, it was only because these were more defenceless, or offered a richer booty ; and because the only chroniclers, the monks, have been more eloquent on their own sufferings ; have dwelt on the sacrilegious, more than on the inhuman acts of their common enemies. The Church now paid dearly for her wealth and possessions : the richer the abbey, the more tempting the prey, the more remorseless the plunderer. France was covered with bishops and monks, flying from their ruined cloisters, their burning monasteries, their desolate churches, bearing with them the precious relics of their saints—their saints who could not defend their violated sanctuaries—and so deepening the universal panic : and everywhere they went they preached despair. The Normans were the instruments in God's hands for the punishment of the sins of the people : it was vain to resist the wrath of God ; and so a wretched fatalism bowed to a more utter prostration the cowed and spiritless race. Even the few ecclesiastics, who saved something from the common wreck, were taxed for the tribute paid by the kings, and

bitterly taunted the kings with this profane invasion of the property of the Church. The great ecclesiastics, indeed, were not all so unwarlike; here and there an abbot took upon him the uncongenial function of captain over his own troops. In the famous siege of Paris, as it were

the consummation of the Norman conquests, the

defenders of the city, with the valiant Count Eudes, were the Bishop Gozlin and his nephew Ebles, Abbot of St. Denys.<sup>a</sup> Yet no sooner had the Normans, from wandering pirates become conquerors of the soil; no sooner had they taken possession of Normandy, than they submitted to Christianity; and it is singular, that they ceased to be Teutons as well as Pagans. The followers of Rollo became Frenchmen as well as Christians; so at a later period, the Normans, already Christians, in Naples became Italians.<sup>b</sup>

Christianity had made some efforts, at an earlier period, to reach the remote regions from which issued forth these terrible Pagans, but without marked or signal success. A fortunate or providential event opened Denmark to her exertions. A contested succession to the throne of that kingdom had driven one of the princes, Harold, to the court and to the protection of Louis the Pious. Charlemagne had already, during his Saxon conquests, entered into an alliance with the ancestor of Harold. That prince embraced the faith of Christ, not only as the price of succour in the contest for his throne, but in zeal and sincerity; he was baptized at Ingelheim with great pomp in the year 826.<sup>1</sup> His sponsors were the Emperor, the Empress Judith, and King Lothair. The return of Harold to Denmark seemed to the Danish Prince, to the bishops

<sup>a</sup> Depping, iii. 1, p. 218. The ten months siege of Paris had its monkish Homer, Abbo. A later poet, more Homeric, Ariosto, had that siege in his thought when he brought the Saracen Agramont under the walls of Paris. Sir F. Palgrave has quoted some of his stanzas.

<sup>b</sup> See Guizot, *Collect. des Memoires*, tom. vi.

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Munter suggests, rather too positively, that the king must have made

the renunciation in the form enacted by S. Boniface at the Synod of Salzburg, A.D. 742.—Eccard. *Franc. Orient.* i. 440. "Forsachistu Diabolæ? R. Ec forsacho Diabolæ. End allum Diabold gelde. R. End ec forsacho allum Diabold gelde. End allum Diaboles Wercum end Wordum. R. End ec forsacho allum Diaboles Wercum end Wordum. Thunaer ende Woden end Saxnote; ende allem them Unholdum, the hera Genotes sint." — G. Ch. Dan. et Norw. p. 268.

of the empire, and to the pious Emperor, too favourable an opportunity to be neglected for the promulgation of the Gospel in that heathen kingdom. A zealous and devoted missionary was invited to undertake the perilous adventure.

The abbey of Corbey, near Amiens, was the great monastic institution in that part of the Empire. Among their abbots had been the famous princes Adalhard and Wala, illegitimate scions of the race of Charles Martel. In that abbey there was a monk of noble French descent, of the gentlest disposition, but of deep and settled piety.\* From his childhood he had been possessed by an ardent imagination; and that imagination, as was sure to be the case in that age, had yielded itself up as a willing bond-slave of religion. At the early age of five, his mother's death had made a strong impression on the sensitive child. A remarkable dream decided his calling. In his sleep he fancied himself struggling on a miry and slippery ground, beyond which lay a beautiful meadow. There he beheld a lady of stately form, in rich attire, surrounded by females in white apparel; among them his mother. He strove to reach her, but the mire clung around his feet, and he could not struggle onward. The soft voice of the majestic lady, the Virgin herself, addressed him, "My son, wouldest thou join thy mother?" He replied, "Most earnestly do I wish it." "He who would come to us must flee those vanities which we abhor." From that moment the serious child, abandoning all sport and gaiety, was devoted to prayer and study. Æt. 13.

Up to adolescence he was educated in monastic discipline, but the ardour of youth had begun to relax his strict austerity. At that time the world was startled by the tidings of Charlemagne's death. That the mighty monarch of so many kingdoms must suffer the common mortality of man, struck the imaginative youth. His life became, as it were, one vision. Once he thought that he had died suddenly; and at the moment of his death he prayed to the apostle St. Peter and to St. John the Baptist,

\* Anschar was born Sept. 8, 801.

who appeared instantly before him.<sup>m</sup> He was conducted by his saintly guides to Purgatory, where he passed three days in darkness, and almost suffocation; these days appeared a thousand years. He passed on to heaven, whose inhabitants and their glory he was permitted to behold; and a voice of the most exquisite sweetness, but so clear that it seemed to fill the world, spoke to him out of the unapproachable light, "Go, and return hither, crowned with martyrdom."<sup>n</sup> On this triumphant end, which he gained at last, not by the sword, but by the slow mortification of his life, was thenceforth set the soul of Anschar.

His thoughts had no doubt been already turned towards the conversion of the heathen, by his residence in a monastic outpost of Christendom, founded by the zeal of the Corbey monks in a beautiful valley on the west bank of the Weser, east of Paderborn, and called New Corbey.<sup>o</sup>

In this convent he had been appointed to preach to the people, and doubtless prepared himself for his future successes.

When the demand was made at the court of Louis the Pious, among the assembled prelates and nobles, who could be found fit and willing to attend the Christian Harold into his Pagan country, and to risk his life for the propagation of the faith, all were silent, until Wala, the abbot of Corbey, bethought him of Anschar. The monk was summoned, and calmly but resolutely undertook the mission. The abbot enquired whether he acted but in obedience to his superior, or from his own free will. He modestly persisted in his determination, unshaken by the persuasion of those who loved him, and the reproof of others, who,

<sup>m</sup> As Anschar knew them at once, it must be supposed that the saints appeared as usually represented in works of art at that time. St. Peter was the older, with a hoary head, the hair flat and bushy; a ruddy complexion, but rather a sad countenance; his dress white, but mingled with colours (*candida et colorata*); his stature short. The Baptist was young, tall, with a sprouting beard; the hair rather dark and curling; the face emaciated, but the countenance

pleasant. He wore a *silk dress*. "Those who wear silk dresses are in kings' chambers!"

<sup>n</sup> The biographer relates this fine vision, as he says, in the words of Anschar himself.—*Vit. S. Anscharii* apud Pertz, vol. ii. p. 692.

<sup>o</sup> It was near the modern Hörter, in Westphalia. It is described by Paschasius Radbertus in his life of Adalhard.—Pertz, ii. p. 531.

unable to aspire to the sublimity of his faith, were jealous of his superiority.

A brother of the convent, named Autbert, though of noble birth, was so kindled by the zeal of Anschar, that he resolved to accompany him. Anschar spent two years in Denmark, but over his difficulties and his successes the biographer passes with unsatisfactory rapidity. He formed a school of twelve children. At the end of the two years his companion retired, in the extremity of sickness, to New Corbey, and died.

But whatever the success of Anschar in Denmark, the more remote regions of the North suddenly opened on the zealous missionary. An embassy from Sweden announced that many of that nation were prepared to accept Christianity. Anschar did not hesitate at once to proceed to this more distant and unknown scene of labour. As he crossed the Sound, his ship was attacked by pirates; he escaped with difficulty to the shore, losing all he possessed, especially the precious treasure of forty books. On his arrival in Sweden, the reigning king allowed him full liberty to preach the Gospel. There were many Christian captives in the land, who gladly welcomed a priest who could administer the sacred mysteries of the faith. Anschar, after some time, returned to France; and Gauzbold, a Frankish monk, was sent as Bishop to Sweden.

In the mean time the archbishopric of Hamburgh had been founded. Anschar was raised to the see, A.D. 832. and invested with metropolitan power over all the northern missions. But the Northmen had as yet learned no respect for Christianity. They surprised Hamburgh. Anschar hardly escaped, A.D. 837. bearing away nothing but the relics of the saints; everything else, even his library, was burned to ashes.

The prospects of Christianity in Sweden were suddenly darkened. The king had favoured the preachers of the Gospel; the people were still obdurately wedded to their idolatry. An insurrection broke out; one Christian teacher suffered death; the Bishop was seized and expelled from the kingdom. For seven years Paganism triumphed without disturbance. Anschar in the mean time

had been reinstated in the archiepiscopate, now formed by the union of Hamburg with Bremen. More hopeful intelligence came from Sweden; it was rumoured that all who had been concerned in the insurrection had, in some awful manner, been marked for untimely death: the possessor of a book, which had been taken during the pillage by his son, was more signally visited by the Divine wrath. But either from prudence or timidity, the Bishop Gauzbold represented himself as personally so obnoxious to the hatred of the people, that his presence could but excite more bitter hostility. Anschar did not hesitate to obey the call; and in the account of this mission appear some curious incidents, characteristic of the versatile Paganism of the country. "If," it was said, "you want a new God, there is your late king, Eric, in whose honour we have lately built a temple." But Anschar, however strongly dissuaded, determined again to try his influence on the Christians' old protector, the king. He invited him to a feast, made him presents; but the king became more cautious or more timid, declared that on so great a question he would consult his people and his gods. True to his word, he first held a private council of his nobles, where it was agreed to consult the gods by lots. The lot was favourable to the acceptance of Christianity; the whole people were then assembled in their parliament; and the herald publicly proclaimed the object of their meeting, the admission or rejection of Christianity. The people were of conflicting opinions. A tumult had almost begun, when an aged man arose, and declared that the God of the Christians had been singularly powerful and propitious, in saving him and others from the perils of the sea, and from pirates. "It would be much wiser, since our own gods are not always so favourable, to have this God also, who is so mighty, and so ready a Protector."<sup>p</sup> This prudent advice carried with it the whole assembly. Christianity was admitted by general consent as a religion permitted by the nation. Churches might be built, and

<sup>p</sup> "Nobis enim quando nostros propitios habere non possumus Deos, bonum est hujus Dei gratiam habere, qui semper in omnibus potest et vult ad se clamantibus auxiliari."—c. xxvii. p. 713.

priests allowed to celebrate the mysteries of the faith. On the death of the king some opposition was at first threatened by his son; his hostility died away; the Christians were even allowed to set up a bell, which seems to have been peculiarly detested by the Swedish Pagans. Once having obtained a footing, Christianity wrought slowly on, till it had achieved the final conversion of the kingdom. But it was not till above a century and a half later, that, under the reign of Canute the Great over the united Christian kingdoms of England and Denmark—were sent over to Denmark English priests and bishops, for the final conversion of his whole continental realm; Canute himself bore as it were the homage of his two Teutonic kingdoms to the feet of the Pontiff of Latin Christianity.<sup>1</sup> The tenth century saw the first dawn of Christianity in Norway.

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Anschar died A.D. 865. Canute, king from 1014 to 1055. Canute visited Rome A.D. 1026 or 1027.

## CHAPTER X.

## ALFRED.

THE Christianity of the age, by this aggrandisement of the sacerdotal order, and the civil wars among the descendants of Charlemagne, seemed to deliver France, and parts of Germany, almost defenceless into the hands of the Pagan Barbarians. A Christian King rescued one part of Europe, which was in still greater danger, from total subjugation to the heathen Northmen.

Our English Alfred<sup>a</sup> approaches, as near as possible, considering his age, to that lofty model, a Christian Sovereign. Some irregularities in his early youth were supposed to be chastised by a severe and inexplicable malady, which seized him at the time of his marriage, and afflicted him during twenty years of his life with excruciating suffering. Even his serene temper was exasperated in the course of the terrific warfare with the Danes, to some acts of more than necessary cruelty and revenge.

The mind of Alfred was deeply impregnated with true Christian faith; as a child he had been twice taken to Rome, but too early, probably, for the majestic sanctity of the holy city to make much impression; yet, no doubt, some vague feeling of reverence must have been left upon his mind by his solemn anointing, as King of Demetia, by the Pope himself. In his youth he was singularly devout; rose before the cock crew for the religious services; and in all the dangers, the troubles, the perpetual wars, the absorbing cares of government, he never intermitted the daily mass, or any of the prayers or ceremonies of the Church.

The heroism of Alfred's resistance to the Danes was not only that of a patriotic sovereign, enduring every extremity in defence of his country against a foreign foe, but that of a Christian offering an inflexible resistance to Pagans and

<sup>a</sup> Alfred was born 849; in Rome, 853 and 855; died, 901.

Barbarians. Religious hope, religious reliance in God, animated him in battle; religious resignation to the divine will sustained him in the depths of adversity. His war against the Danes was a crusade with all which demands generous sympathy and admiration—nothing which shocks the purer Christian feeling.

Alfred alone rescued England from a total return to Paganism and barbarity; and delayed the Danish conquest till the Northmen had been at least partially conquered, and in some degree softened by Christianity. So nearly was this retrogressive movement achieved; so nearly was the whole island in the possession of these desolating invaders; that the Danes were at once on every coast, and in almost every part of the centre of the island: they are at once burning Lindisfarn, and fighting a great battle in Devonshire. At one time they have possession of Canterbury, Rochester, and London; at other times of Winchester, Exeter, York, Nottingham, Reading, Chippenham in Wiltshire, Cambridge.<sup>b</sup> Their numbers were so magnified by the terrors of the people, that if 30,000 are reported as killed in one day, they are said to be succeeded the next by double the number. The churches and the monasteries were the chief objects of Danish enmity and spoliation, no doubt, as in France, from their wealth and defencelessness; they were the only places which offered rich and easy booty. Even the religious enthusiasm of the people was cowed, and almost extinct under these incessant persecutions. Its most popular and prevailing impulse, that which, in other countries, had seemed only to grow stronger in times of public calamity, the eagerness for a monastic life, had died away. When Alfred wished to found two monasteries, one for men at Athelney, one for females at Shaftesbury, he found not a single free or noble person disposed to be a monk or nun.<sup>c</sup> He was obliged to assemble them from all orders and all parts—some from beyond the sea, especially from France—there was one Pagan, Asser significantly says, “not the last.”

<sup>b</sup> See in Depping the plunder of Croyland, Medhamstead, Ely, and Coldingham, p. 141; Asser, p. 29.

<sup>c</sup> Asser, p. 61. “Nimirum, quia per multa retroacta annorum curricula mo-

nasticæ vitæ desiderium ab illâ totâ gente, necnon et a multis aliis gentibus funditus interierat.” Asser, among his reasons, gives one we should scarcely have expected,—the *wealth* of the nation.

Alfred felt no security until he had compelled his enemies to Christianity; this was the one end and assurance of victory. The first fruits of his great triumph at

Eddington was the baptism of Guthrun, with thirty  
A.D. 879. of his chieftains.<sup>d</sup> This was the only guarantee for their faith—a precarious guarantee. This alone changed them from fierce and roving marauders to settled inhabitants of the land.

Alfred is no less memorable as preserving the close connection between Christianity and civilisation. It is difficult to understand how, after the long and total devastation of the kingdom by the Danes, Alfred could erect the buildings, pile up the castles, build the fleets, endow the churches and monasteries, if not schools; and send out the embassies, which might seem to demand more flourishing finances. He divided, it is said, his whole revenue into two parts; one devoted to secular, the other to religious purposes.\* The latter was subdivided into four; one assigned to the poor, one to his monasteries of Athelney and Shaftesbury, one to the school, which he had founded for his nobles, one for the monasteries of the rest of the kingdom, with occasional gifts to foreign religious houses.

Up to twelve years of age, Alfred, the favourite of his parents, and the best hunter in the Court, was ignorant of his letters. His mother offered a richly-embellished volume of Saxon poetry to that one of her children who would learn to read it. Alfred, by divine inspiration, writes his biographer, and attracted by the beauty of the capital letters, immediately set about the task and won the prize. The love of letters was thus stamped upon his heart; he constantly carried in his bosom a book of psalms and prayers, which he read himself—a rare accomplishment, almost unrivalled in the whole kingdom of the West Saxons. His youthful prize may have suggested, or urged on him more strongly, the great work of Alfred: his powerful encouragement of the native Saxon literature, the

<sup>d</sup> Page 35.

\* Asser relates that when the king gave him the two monasteries of Amesbury and Banwell, he presented him with a silken pallium of great value, and as much incense as a strong man could carry! This must have been a most

costly gift!--P. 50. Can we suppose that the Danes having plundered all the religious houses, there was great store of this, to them, useless commodity among the booty which Alfred recovered and could not restore to its lawful owners?

identification of Christianity with the manners, language, poetry, not of a half Roman, but purely Teutonic race. Alfred delighted in all the old Saxon poems; he collected and caused to be recited Saxon books; and so, instead of being the religion of a learned priesthood, the Anglo-Saxon Christianity was familiarised and endeared to the people; it was a popular national faith. The knowledge of Latin, Alfred thought, would rather be promoted than discouraged by the translation of books into the vulgar tongue. It was a work of love in which he laboured himself, not only from delight, but from want of assistants. In the whole land south of the Trent, there were few priests who could translate Latin into English;<sup>f</sup> south of the Thames, at his accession, not one. What is more extraordinary, it was a religion which went back to the pure and primal sources of the faith—the sacred Scriptures. The poetry, the tradition of which Alfred continued from the monk Cædmon, was not a poetry exclusively of legend, of the lives and wonders of the Saints, but of the Sacred History thrown into the language and metre of Saxon poetry. It had its popular saints with their metrical lives;<sup>g</sup> but its greatest poets had still reverted to the higher source of inspiration. Alfred, indeed, had not the high poetic gift of the older Cædmon. His works are those of the laborious man of learning, communicating the traditionary treasures of knowledge, which remained from the older civilisation, to his Saxon subjects. King Alfred gave to Saxon England the Ecclesiastical History of Bede; the epitome of Augustine's great works by Orosius. He gave them the Consolation of Boëthius, and the Pastoral of St. Gregory. He summoned from all quarters men of learning: Asser came from St. David's, John of Saxony from the Abbey of Corbey; Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims sent Grimbold, Provost of St. Omer. The University of Oxford boasts, but on very doubtful authority, to owe her foundation to Alfred the Great.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>f</sup> *Præfatio ad Greg. Past.*, in Wise's Alfred, p. 87.

<sup>g</sup> See, on the poetry of Cædmon, above. Mr. Thorpe, in his curious volume from

the Exeter Code, has a long poetical life of St. Guthlak, another of St. Juliana. .

<sup>h</sup> Compare Lingard, i. p. 179.

## CHAPTER XI.

## THE HUNGARIANS. DEGRADATION OF THE PAPACY.

IN the tenth century the few reflecting minds might not without reason apprehend the approaching dissolution of the world. A vast anarchy seemed to spread over Western Christendom. It is perhaps the darkest period in the history of every country in Europe. The Pagan Magyars, more terrible even than the Islamite Saracens, and the Pagan Northmen, now burst upon Europe. The Arabs, who had swarmed from their deserts, wild marauders, had long become disciplined armies: Islam had become a mighty empire. The Caliphate maintained the show at least of ascendancy over the Sultanies of Africa and of Spain. Arabic was the language of whole regions, almost of continents. The Northmen, fierce pirates as they were, were of origin kindred to the Teutonic conquerors of France. Both Saracens and Northmen acknowledged some rude laws of war. But the Magyars, or Hungarians, seemed as hordes of savages or of wild beasts let loose upon mankind.\* They burst unexpectedly upon Christendom in swarms of which the source seemed unknown and inexhaustible. Indiscriminate massacre seemed their only war law; they were bound by no treaties, respected no boundaries. Civilisation, Christianity withered before their hosts, who were magnified by panic into misshapen monsters, and cannibals who fed on human flesh. Their language, of the Finnish stock, was akin to no known tongue. In those days of disorder and anarchy in Christendom, it is almost incredible that a single race, even if it swept with them many of the tribes who lay on the borders of civilisation, Slavians and Bulgarians, could have so completely covered Europe, as to range over the whole of Germany; burn nearly

Tenth cen-  
tury.

The Hun-  
garians.

\* Gibbon, ch. lv. vol. x. pp. 193-209.

at the same time Bremen on the Baltic, and the monastery of St. Gall, near the lake of Constance; overrun Southern France, and menace the kingdoms beyond the Pyrenees. They rushed down the Alps, Italy lay open before them. Splendid Pavia, with its forty-three churches, was in ashes; everywhere the walls of the cities were hastily repaired; special litanies resounded in all the churches of Italy which escaped their ravages for protection against the Hungarians; Rome beheld at no great distance the flame of their devastation; they spread to the very extremity of the peninsula.<sup>b</sup> The Hungarians for half a century were the common terror of Christendom, from their first irruption about A.D. 884 to A.D. 936, the date of the first great victory of Henry the Fowler. Gradually the Magyars settled down on the limits of modern Hungary. At the beginning of the next century Christianity had entirely subdued them, and with a kind of prophetic wisdom had arrayed this valiant nation as a future outguard against the Mohammedan Turks; their King Stephen was a Saint.

Cast a rapid glance over Christendom during these disastrous invasions of Saracens, Normans, Hungarians.

In England, though the wise institutions of Alfred, and now and then a king, like Athelstan, of more commanding character, maintained some social order, almost the whole period was an un-  
State of  
Western  
Christendom.  
England.
interrupted war with the Danes. The Church was distracted by the implacable contests between the secular and regular clergy. In France the Carlovingian race was expiring almost in the same state of imbecility and powerlessness as the Merovingians whom they supplanted. Towards the close of this period the new race of the Capets rose to the throne, the first purely French dynasty. The Normans were now in settled possession of a great province in the kingdom.

<sup>b</sup> The Chronic. Wurz. sub ann. 938, sums up their ravages: "Ungarii Franciam, Alemanniam, Galliam, usque Oceanum et Burgundiam devastantes per Italiam redierunt, monasteria S. Galli et S. Bonifacii cremantur." The chronicles of almost every monastery—and a great

number of monasteries in all quarters had their chronicle—record the losses, ruin, and desolation inflicted by these terrible strangers.—Apud Pertz, ii. p. 241, &c. Compare Liutprand, lib. ii. in init. One of Muratori's dissertations describes their ravages in Italy.

The Empire alone displayed occasional vigour, rather from the commanding character of Henry the Germany. Fowler, the first conqueror of the Magyars, of Otho the Great and his descendants, than from the Imperial power itself. The legitimate descent from Charlemagne had expired in Louis III., the illegitimate in Arnulf. The imperial crown had passed from Italy, and back to Germany. It had become an Elective Sovereignty, as yet with no established rule or form of election, and had been for a short time absolutely suspended: it resumed its greatness under the House of Saxony.

But the deepest abasement, or rather almost annihilation, had already fallen on the Papacy. Abasement of the Papacy. Italy, which for a time pretended to the Empire, without a native prince of sufficient power or dignity to maintain its influence, constantly summoning new sovereigns from beyond the Alps to assume that perilous honour, until the right of election was resumed by Germany, was one battle-field of small contending princes, each endeavouring to form or to aggrandise an hereditary principality. The terror of the Hungarians increased at once the confusion, and, by compelling the more strong and artificial fortification of the cities, tended to their more complete isolation; each city became an independent government; each chieftain aspired to be a sovereign. This anarchy of Italy led to the degradation of the Papacy, the degradation of the Papacy increased the anarchy of Italy. So insignificant is the Pope become, that it is almost as difficult to trace now for a long period, as afterwards at the close of the century, the regular succession. The Pope steals unnoticed into his dignity, and departs from it as unregarded; or rather is suddenly thrust into the throne by some act of violence, and as suddenly dispossessed by means as violent.

To none in the Christian world seems to have occurred the extraordinary anomaly, the election of a Undetermined form of election. ritual monarch for Christendom (for so he was esteemed in the West) by a body neither in character nor in general esteem representing the community. A single city aspired to nominate the universal Bishop; but that

city was Rome; and Europe was resolutely ignorant what strange accidents, caprices, crimes, intrigues, even assassinations determined the rise and fall of the Supreme Pontiff. It is a memorable instance of the vital power of names, that the Christian world so long assented, without protest, apparently without consciousness of wrong, to the pretensions not only of the clergy but of the nobles and people of Rome, and whatever soldiery, either Roman or foreign, might command the city, to be the electors of the spiritual autocrat. The assent of the Emperor, at first of the East through the Exarch of Ravenna, afterwards of Charlemagne and his descendants, in theory at least esteemed necessary for the consecration of the Supreme Pontiff, had given to the world, or rather to Latin Christendom, some control over, at least some concurrence in, the election. But when the Empire itself was in abeyance, and Italy asserted her independence, forming a separate political system, with an elective king, and a number of dukes, counts, and princes, who recognised only when forcibly compelled, the supreme authority; at this inauspicious time the absolute election of the Pope reverted to this ill-organised democracy, or, as it were, to these conflicting democracies. Whoever now obtained the mastery of Rome by any means of violence, intrigue, or faction, the neighbouring prince, the demagogue, the rude soldier, or the daring woman, nominated the head of Christendom. The Pope was himself one of those violent or licentious men, or an insignificant personage only performing the religious functions of his office, and holding his office, even his life, at the will of this shifting but perpetual tyranny.

On the other hand, the authority of the Pope, if not in the nomination—in the coronation of the Emperor—if it entangled him too inextricably in secular affairs, had given great dignity to his position. This continued so long as the Empire passed in a direct line down the descendants of Charlemagne; but even already, as soon as the claim had come to be contested, the Pope, with not power enough to be the arbiter, sank into the partisan of one of the

contending factions. Rome, become the centre of this strife, added to her own conflicting parties, that of rival Kings struggling for the Empire. Already the Pope had to choose between the dynasties of France and Germany or Italy. Each interest maintained its hired or devoted partisans in Rome, either thwarting or urging the Pope to hostile measures against its adversaries; at the time of each election to the Popedom exciting or maddening the contest. The Papal throne, even before it had assumed the power of awarding thrones and dictating to mankind, had been an object of fierce, or at times of sanguinary strife; and all these foreign and political influences exasperated the fierce collision of personal conflict, while all around were lawless chieftains, ready to interfere with or without cause, to espouse any interest, and to aggrandize or enrich themselves at the expense of the metropolis of Christendom.

This iron age, as it has been called, opened with the Pontificate of Benedict IV.,<sup>c</sup> the successor of John IX. The only act recorded of Benedict IV. was the coronation<sup>d</sup> of the unfortunate Louis of Provence, the competitor of Berengar for the empire. Louis, according to Imperial usage, set up his tribunal, and adjudged causes at Rome.

A.D. 901.

On the death of Benedict, the prudent precautions established by John IX., to introduce some regularity and control over the anarchy of an election by a clergy rent into factions, a lawless nobility, and still more lawless people, during this utter helplessness, the abeyance, or the strife for the empire between rival princes, fell into utter neglect, or impotency. The Papacy became the prize of the most active, daring, and violent. Leo V.

won the prize; before two months he was ejected and thrown into prison<sup>e</sup> by Christopher, one of his own presbyters and chaplains. The same year, or early in the next, Christopher was in his turn ignominiously driven from Rome.

A.D. 903.

<sup>c</sup> July, A.D. 900; died, 903, Aug.

<sup>d</sup> 901, Feb. Boehmer, Regesta.

<sup>e</sup> "Emigrat ante suum quam luna his impleat orbem."—*Flodoard, de Pontif. Rom. apud Mabillon, Acta. S. S. Benedict.*

Sergius had already once, if not twice, at the accession of John IX.,<sup>4</sup> or at that of Formosus, or at both periods, contested the Papal chair. On his discomfiture he had taken refuge at the Court of the powerful counts of Tuscany; and there sate watching, with a band of devoted partisans, the rapid revolutions in Rome.

This great marquisate, or county of Tuscany, which for a long period exercised so vast an influence for evil or for good, had gradually risen to its enormous power and wealth: power which for many years ruled Rome and the Papacy; wealth which at length, through the munificence of the celebrated Countess Matilda, its descendant through another line, was hereafter to be the strength and support of the Popes in the days of their most exorbitant authority.

The descent of these hereditary Counts of Lucca, and Marquises or Dukes of Tuscany, is clearly traced from Boniface, who held that rank during the later years of Charlemagne. Adalbert was the grandson of Boniface, through a father of the same name. Adalbert had been among those powerful princes, whose claims to beneficiary rights had excited the jealous resentment of the Emperor Louis the Pious. He had been imprisoned, and though soon released, had sworn to avenge the indignity on the first opportunity. Adalbert II., the son of Adalbert I., was so surpassingly wealthy (and wealth in those times was power) that he was called the Rich. His influence, as well as his ambition, was increased by his marriage with Bertha, daughter of the King Lothair, by his wife or concubine, Waldrada, and the widow of the King of Provence. This haughty woman was mother, by her first husband, of Hugh of Provence, afterwards King of Italy, and Emperor. The counsels of his imperious wife led Adalbert into a premature rebellion against Lambert, then Emperor, and King of Italy. The Tuscan was defeated ignominiously, and thrown into prison. He had been taken in a stable.<sup>5</sup> Lambert in-

<sup>4</sup> *Culmen apostolice sedis is jure paterno  
Electus tenuit, ut Theodorus obit,  
Joannes subit.*  
*Epitaph in Pagi, sub ann. 910.*

<sup>5</sup> Liutprand, ii. 38.

sulted him by saying, "Your haughty wife Bertha prophesied that you would be a king or an ass; lo, you are found like an ass in the stalls among the cattle!" The death of Lambert, by accident or assassination, released Adalbert from his captivity, and restored him to his power. From this time the fate of Italy seemed to depend upon his will. The fickle Italians, weary of the rule of Berengar, who on the death of Lambert had become undisputed possessor of the empire, invited Louis

A.D. 900.

of Provence, the son of Count Boso, and of Ermengard, daughter of the Emperor Louis of Germany, to assume the throne of Italy and the empire. Adalbert at first maintained the cause of Berengar (his fidelity was secured by ample gifts), and Louis was obliged to retreat beyond the Alps. But the ambitious Bertha alienated the mind of her husband from Berengar.<sup>b</sup> Adalbert joined in a second invitation to Louis. Berengar, when he found the Tuscans among his enemies, shut himself up in Verona, which he was obliged to surrender to the victorious Louis. The new Emperor and King of Italy was crowned in Rome.<sup>1</sup> On his return he visited Lucca, where the indiscreet Emperor beheld with astonishment, alarm, and envy, the state, and the formidable and well-appointed forces of Adalbert. He dropped the incautious expression, "This is no marquis, but a king." From that moment the throne of Louis was lost. Bertha

A.D. 906.

organized an extensive revolt of the Italian provinces. Louis allowed himself to be surprised in Verona by Berengar, who revenged himself by putting out the eyes of his rival.

It was under the protection of this powerful Tuscan that the exiled Sergius, at the head of a strong force of Tuscan soldiers, appeared in Rome, deposed Christopher,<sup>k</sup> who had just deposed Leo V., and took possession of the Papal throne.

A.D. 897-904; Sergius had been seven years an exile in

<sup>b</sup> "Bellus Tyrrhenis fundens fera sibilis ab oris  
Solicitat Rhodani gentem."  
*Panegyrr. Berengar. iv.*

<sup>1</sup> 901. I follow Muratori's course of events.

<sup>k</sup> Christopher, consecrated Oct. 903; deposed, and becomes a monk, Jan. 904.

Tuscany; for seven years he ruled as supreme, but not undisputed Pontiff. This Pope has been loaded with every vice and every enormity which can <sup>A.D. 904-911.</sup> blacken the character of man.<sup>m</sup> Yet as to his reign there is almost a total obscurity. The only certain act which has transpired is his restoration of the Lateran palace, which had fallen into ruins; an act which indicates a period of comparative peace and orderly administration, with the command of a large revenue.<sup>n</sup> In these violent times Sergius probably scrupled at no violence; but if he drove a Pope from the throne of St. Peter, that Pope had just before deposed his patron, and with great cruelty.<sup>o</sup>

But during the papacy of Sergius rose into power the infamous Theodora, with her daughters Marozia and Theodora, the prostitutes who, in the strong language of historians, disposed for many years of the Papal tiara, and not content with disgracing by their own licentious lives the chief city of Christendom, actually placed their profligate paramours or base-born sons in the chair of St. Peter. The influence obtained by Theodora and her daughters, if it shows not the criminal connivance of Pope Sergius, or a still more disgraceful connexion with which he was charged by the scandal of the times, proves at least the utter degradation of the Papal power in Rome. It had not only lost all commanding authority, but could not even maintain outward decency. Theodora was born of a noble and wealthy senatorial family, on whom she has entailed an infamous immortality. The women of Rome seem at successive periods seized with a kind of Roman ambition to surpass their sex by the greatness of their virtues and of their vices. These females were to the Paulas and Eustochiums of the younger and severer age of Roman Christianity, what the Julias and Messalinas of the

<sup>m</sup> "Sergius inde redit, dudum, qui lectus ad arcem

Culminia, exilio tulerat rapiente repulsum.  
Quo profugus latuit Septem volventibus annis.  
Hinc populi remeans precibus sacratur honore  
Pridem adsignato, quo nomine Tertius exit  
Antistes, Petri eximii quo sede recepto  
Præule gaudet ovans annis Septem amplius  
orbis."—*Flodoard de Rom. Pontif.*

<sup>n</sup> Mabillon, in *Appendic. ad Ord. Roman.* Muratori, sub ann. 907.

<sup>o</sup> See also the epitaph on Sergius apud Muratori, A.D. 911. Yet even Sergius is regulating the affairs and granting the pallium to an archbishop of Hamburg.—*Jaffé, Regesta*, p. 308.

empire were to the Volumnias and Cornelias of the Republic.<sup>p</sup>

It must be acknowledged, that if the stern language of Tacitus and Juvenal may have darkened the vices of the queens and daughters of the Cæsars, the Bishop of Cremona, our chief authority on the enormities of Theodora and her daughters, wants the moral dignity, while he is liable to the same suspicion as those great writers. Throughout the lives of the Pontiffs themselves we have to balance between the malignant license of satire and the unmeaning phrases of adulatory panegyric.<sup>q</sup> On the other hand it is difficult to decide which is more utterly unchristian: the profound hatred which could invent or accredit such stories; the utter dissoluteness which made them easily believed; or the actual truth of such charges.

Liutprand relates that John, afterwards the tenth Pope of that name, being employed in Rome on some ecclesiastical matters by the Archbishop of Ravenna, was the paramour of Theodora,<sup>r</sup> who not merely allowed, but compelled him to her embraces. John was first appointed to the see of Bologna; but the archbishopric of Ravenna, the second ecclesiastical dignity in Italy, falling vacant before he had been consecrated, he was advanced by the same dominant

Theodora.

John X.

<sup>p</sup> The devout indignation of Baronius, as to these times, arose no doubt in great part from the severe but honest asceticism of his character, and his horror at this violation of his high notions of sacerdotal sanctity by what appeared to him far more unseemly and unpardonable criminality than arrogance, avarice, or cruelty. His fears, too, lest he should be accused of an immoral partiality by the slightest extenuation, or even by a dispassionate examination of such vices, has led him to exaggerate rather than soften the monstrous enormities of those times. And the happy thought, happy in a thoroughgoing controversialist, that the deeper the degradation of the Papacy, the more wonderful, and therefore the more manifestly of God its restoration to power, removed every remaining repugnance to his abandonment of all the popes during the tenth century to histo-

rical infamy. The passage is too well known and too long for citation. Muratori, who had some new authorities, is more temperate, especially as to the character of Sergius.

<sup>q</sup> Liutprand is the chief, the only authority on which Baronius rests. Muratori inclines to the Panegyrist of Berengarius, who gives a high character of John X., and to Flodoard; but the poet's language consists merely of the common phrases applied to all popes, who are, according to some writers, ex officio endowed with certain virtues: and Pope John had just acknowledged the title, and entered into close alliance with the object of the poet's panegyric.

<sup>r</sup> "Theodora, . . . quod dictu etiam fœdissimum est, Romanæ civitatis non invirriter monarchiam obtinebat." — Liutprand.

influence to that see.\* But Theodora bore with impatience the separation of two hundred miles from her lover. Anastasius III. had succeeded Sergius, and occupied the Papacy for rather more than two years; after him Lando for six months. On the death of Lando, by a more flagrant violation of the canonical rule, than that charged against the dead body of Formosus, John was translated from the archiepiscopate of Ravenna to the see of Rome. But Theodora, if she indeed possessed this dictatorial power, and the clergy and people of Rome, if they yielded to her dictation, may have been actuated by nobler and better motives than her gratification of a lustful passion, if not by motives purely Christian. For however the Archbishop of Ravenna might be no example of piety or holiness as the spiritual head of Christendom, he appears to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office. He was a man of ability and daring, eminently wanting at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of the Mohammedan conquest. The Saracens occupied a strong fortress on the Garigliano,<sup>1</sup> which, while it secured their own southern conquests, constantly threatened the dukedoms beyond their border; the whole domain or territory of St. Peter lay at their mercy. They commanded, and could interrupt almost all communication with the South of Italy. The pilgrims could not reach the shrines of the apostles without being plundered, maltreated, often made prisoners, and obliged to ransom themselves at enormous prices.

The Pontiff placed himself at the head of a powerful confederacy of the neighbouring dukes, who were either

\* Muratori has suggested a most serious objection to the story of Liutprand. That author says that the translation of John from Ravenna to Rome took place "modicâ temporis intercapedine," after his appointment to Ravenna. There is strong evidence for supposing John to have been Archbishop of Ravenna from 905 to 914, a long period for such a passion as Theodora's to endure delay. Are we to suppose that, though Archbishop of Ravenna, he resided at Rome? "Joannes Archiepiscopus Ravennatis ecclesiæ, incitatus

a primatibus Romanæ urbis, contra instituta canonum, agens, Romanæ ecclesiæ invasor factus."—Chron. S. Benedict. apud Pertz. Compare Chron. Mon. Cass. apud Pertz, Liutprand. "Theodoræ autem glycerii meus perversa, Ravennatem hunc præsulatum coegit deserere, Romanumque, pro nefas! summum pontificium usurpare."—c. 48.

<sup>1</sup> The poet calls this fortress the "vicina Charybdis," which swallowed up all the wealth of Rome.—De Laudib. Berengar.

Sept. 911.  
Nov. 913.  
May, 914.

John X.  
May 15, 914.

awed or persuaded into a league for mutual defence: it comprehended Landulf, the Duke of Benevento and Capua, the Dukes of Spoleto and Camerina. But a stronger effort was necessary; it was determined to demand the aid of the two Emperors, those of the West and of the East, in the common cause of Christendom. Con-

March 24, 916.  
Coronation of  
the Emperor  
Berengar.

stantine, the Emperor of the East, promised naval succours. Berengar was now undisputed Emperor of the West; he accepted the invitation, and went in person to Rome. His poetical panegyrist has left a glowing description of his power, and the magnificence of his reception. He was met by the Senate with their banners, which represented the heads of wild beasts. They sang his praises in their Latin or Italian tongue. The Senate was followed by the schools of strangers, the Greek among the rest, who each paid their homage to the Emperor in their native dialect. The nobles were represented by Peter, the brother of the Pope, and the son of Theophylact, called by the poet the Consul of Rome. The Popes were accustomed to receive the Emperors standing on the top of the steps leading up to St. Peter's. Latterly they had assumed the more dignified attitude of remaining seated. The Emperor took the Pope's white horse, according to usage.\* He ascended the steps, was received and saluted by the Pope with a kiss. After the Emperor had sworn to maintain the privileges and possessions of the Church, they entered the church hand in hand, the Pope chanting the service. The Emperor knelt and worshipped at the tomb of St. Peter, and was afterwards received at a splendid banquet by the Pope. The coronation and anointing took place the day after Easter-day. The donations of Pepin and Charlemagne were read, with all the domains granted to the successor of St. Peter, as a warning lest any robber should presume to usurp those sacred lands.† But the Pope was not content with his legitimate

A.D. 916.

of Pepin and Charlemagne were read, with all the domains granted to the successor of St. Peter, as a warning lest any robber should presume to usurp those sacred lands.‡ But the Pope was not content with his legitimate

\* "Erectus Pastoris equo, mox quippe sacerdos  
Ipse futurus erat, titulo res digna perenni."

See the note of Valesius. There seems to have been some symbolical meaning which is far from clear. Does it imply

that the Emperor, by being anointed, assumed a sacerdotal character?

‡ "Lectitat Augusti concessos munere pagos,  
Præsulis obsequio gradibus stans lector in altis,  
Cæsare quo norint omnes data munera, prælo  
Ulterius paveat sacras sibi sumere terras."

influence, in organizing this great league for the preservation, if not of Christendom, at least of Rome, from the unbelievers. He placed himself at the head of the army, and for the first time, the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of the Prince of Peace, rode forth in his array to battle. And, if success, as it doubtless was, might be interpreted as a manifestation of Divine approval, the total discomfiture of the Saracens, the destruction of this troublesome fortress on the Garigliano, seemed to sanction this new and unseemly character assumed by the Pope. Even the Apostles sanctioned or secured by their presence, the triumph of the warlike Pope.<sup>7</sup> Aug. 11, 916.

For fourteen years, obscure as regards Rome and the Pontificate, this powerful prelate occupied the See of Rome. If he gained it (a doubtful charge) by the vices and influence of the mother Theodora, he lost it, together with his life, by the no less flagrant vices, and more monstrous power, of the daughter, Marozia. A.D. 914-928.

Theodora disappears; and Pope John X. is found engaged in a fierce contest for the mastery of Rome with Marozia and her lover or husband, the Marquis Alberic,<sup>8</sup> by whom she had a son of the same name, afterwards tyrant of the city. The vigorous and martial Pontiff succeeds in expelling Alberic from the city; Alberic probably met his death soon after. It is said that he was murdered by the Romans in revenge for some secret alliance entered into with the Hungarians, who were then wasting Italy, and had reached the very frontiers of Calabria. Marozia.  
A.D. 925.

The death of her husband increased rather than weakened the power of Marozia. Her personal charms, and her unscrupulous use of them, are said to have multiplied to an infinite extent her adherents. Her paramours made a strong party. The Empire was vacant. There was no

<sup>7</sup> "A religiosis fidelibus visi sunt in eodem bello sanctissimi Petrus et Paulus apostoli."—Liutprand, c. 54.

<sup>8</sup> Muratori has clearly proved the mistake, or perhaps false reading, in Liutprand, followed by Baronius and others. The lover of Marozia was not

and could not be Adalbert the Rich, the Duke of Tuscany, the husband of the imperious Bertha, and the protector of Sergius. Adalbert does not seem to have been at Rome. The lover of Marozia was Alberic, Marquis (Marchio) perhaps of Camerina.

potentate to whom the Pope could appeal. Marozia seized the Castle of St. Angelo, and with this precious dowry, which commanded Rome, she sought to confirm her power by some splendid alliance. Guido, the Duke of Tuscany, the son of Adalbert the Marquis, did not disdain the nuptials with a profligate woman, who brought Rome as her marriage portion.

During the rapid and bloody revolutions of the few last years in Italy, this house of Tuscany had maintained its greatness. Soon after the death of Adalbert the Rich, the widow Bertha, and Guido her son, plunged into their quarrel with the Emperor Berengar, then at the height of his power; they had been imprisoned, but speedily obtained their release, and recovered all their wealth and power. Bertha had extended her influence by the marriage of her daughter, Ermengard, a woman of unprincipled ambition, worthy of her mother, with Adalbert, the Marquis of Ivrea, whose first wife had been a daughter of the Emperor Berengar, and who was the most powerful of the northern princes.

The murder of Berengar (who died unpitied,\* for in his last contest with the new usurper of the empire, A.D. 922. Rodolf of Burgundy, he had made a treaty with the terrible Hungarians, now the scourge of the North, as the Saracens were of the South) had made the empire vacant, and threw the whole north of Italy into the utmost confusion. Ermengard, now a widow, and if Liutprand is to be credited, of unscrupulous license, not with princes only, but even with ignoble men,<sup>b</sup> became the object and the promotress of all the intrigues, feuds, and murders, on account of the kingdom of Italy.

The strife ended with the descent into Italy of Hugh of Provence, the son of Bertha by her first husband, and so half brother to Guido of Tuscany. Hugh of Provence. Hugh of Provence, the new competitor for the kingdom of Italy and the Empire, landed at Pisa. This crafty Prince fully estimated the influence of the clergy in the politics of Italy. He affected the most profound zeal for

\* Liutprand, c. 61.

<sup>b</sup> "Carnale cum non solum princi-

pibus, verum etiam ignobilibus, commercium exercebat."—iii. 7.

religion. He was a man, for his day, of many accomplishments, and sought the society of those whom Liutprand dignifies by the name of philosophers. Liutprand himself, the future historian, ambassador at Constantinople and Bishop of Cremona, was brought up as a page in the court of Hugh of Provence; and though the unbounded licentiousness as to women could not but offend the pious ecclesiastic, the courtly historian touches with great tenderness the other vices, not by any means the lightest, of his royal patron.

The clergy of Italy, flattered by the homage, hailed the landing of Hugh at Pisa, as the restoration of an age of peace and piety. Lanthbert, Archbishop of Milan, was his ardent partisan, and hastened to meet him at Pavia. The Pope himself, notwithstanding the connexion of Hugh with the husband of Marozia, hoped, perhaps, with the prize of the Imperial crown, to secure his protection against his domestic tyrants. He went to meet him at Mantua: a treaty was entered into, but the conditions are unknown. July 19, 926.

The last hopes, however, of foreign protection were vain. John X. was left to contest alone the government of Rome with Marozia and her Tuscan husband. Neither Rome, nor the mistress of Rome, regarded the real services rendered by John X. to Christendom and to Italy. The former lover, as public scandal averred, of her mother, the saviour of Rome from the Saracens, was surprised in the Lateran palace by this daring woman. His brother Peter, as it appears, his great support in the contest for the government of Rome, and therefore the object of peculiar hatred to Guido and Marozia, was killed before his face. The Pope was thrown into prison, where some months after he died, either of anguish and despair, or by more summary means. It was rumoured that he was smothered by a pillow. No means were too violent for Marozia to employ, even against a Pope.<sup>d</sup> Death of John X.  
A.D. 928.

Marozia did not venture at once to place her son on

<sup>d</sup> Flodoard, Annal. 929; Liutprand, iii. 43; Annal. Benevent. "Moritur Papa Johannes in castro jugulatus."

the Papal throne. A Leo VI. was Pope for some months; a Stephen VII. for two years and one month. That son may as yet have been too young even for this shameless woman to advance him to the highest ecclesiastical dignity; her husband Guido may have had some lingering respect for the sacred office, some struggling feelings of decency. But at the death of Stephen, Marozia again ruled alone in Rome; her husband Guido was dead, and her son was Pope. John XI. (according to the rumours of the time of which Liutprand, a follower of Hugh of Provence, may be accepted as a faithful reporter) was the offspring of Marozia, by the Pope Sergius: more trustworthy authorities make him the lawful son of her husband Alberic. But the obsequious clergy and people acquiesced without resistance in the commands of their patrician mistress; the son of Marozia is successor of St. Peter.

But the aspiring Marozia, not content with having been the wife of a Marquis, of the wealthy and powerful Duke of Tuscany, perhaps the mistress of one, certainly the mother of another Pope, looked still higher in her lustful ambition; she must wed a monarch. She sent to offer herself and the city of Rome to the new King of Italy.

Hugh of Provence was not scrupulous in his amours, lawful or unlawful. Through policy or through passion, he was always ready to form or to break these tender connexions. Yet there was an impediment, a canonical impediment to this marriage, which even Hugh and Marozia dared not despise. Guido, the late husband of Marozia, and Hugh of Provence, were sons of the same mother. Even the Levitical law, which seems to have occurred to some, would not assist them,\* for Marozia had borne children to Guido.<sup>f</sup> Hugh struck out a happy expedient, at the same time to get over this difficulty, to be master of Rome, and to enable himself to fulfil the other great object of his ambition, the seizure of

\* Liutprand interlards his history with verses:—

"Hæc tibi Moyseos non præstant carmina, vates  
Qui fratri sobolem fratris de nomine jusalt  
Edere, si primus nequeat sibi gignere natum,

Nostra tuo peperisse viro te sæcula norunt,  
Respondes scio, tu, sed non Venus ebria curat."

<sup>f</sup> These children probably died early; nothing is heard of them.

the Tuscan Dukedom. Truth, justice, and the interests of her late husband's family, were alike insignificant in the eyes of Marozia. Lambert, a man of courage and character, had succeeded his brother Guido in the dukedom. Dukedom of Tuscany. Lambert. Hugh of Provence began by disseminating rumours, that Bertha had no children by her husband Adalbert; that Guido, Lambert, and Ermengard, were all supposititious, and imposed on the weak Adalbert by his crafty wife as his own. Lambert had adopted that last strange resource, so imposing and convincing in those days, in order to vindicate his father's wisdom, his mother's honour, and his own legitimacy. He offered the wager of battle to any champion appointed by the King of Italy. A brave and youthful warrior was chosen. Lambert came off victorious. Foiled in this attempt, King Hugh contrived to seize Lambert by treachery, and to put out his eyes. The rich inheritance and the power of Tuscany passed without resistance to Boso, brother of Hugh. Successful crime made Hugh of Provence only more welcome to Marozia. The King of Italy drew near to Rome: the cautious Marozia would not allow his army to enter the city, but received her royal bridegroom in the Castle of St. Angelo. There was celebrated this unhal-  
lowed marriage.<sup>5</sup>

But the Romans would brook the dominion of a Roman woman, they would not endure that of a foreigner. The coarse vices, the gluttony of the soldiers of Hugh, offended the fastidious Italians. The insolence of Hugh himself provoked a rebellion. The nobles were called upon to perform menial offices, usual probably in the half-feudal Transalpine courts, but alien to their manners. Alberic, the son of Marozia, was commanded to hold the water in which King Hugh washed his hands. Performing his office awkwardly or reluctantly, he spilled the water, and received a blow on the face from the king. Already may Alberic have been jealous of the promotion of his brother to the popedom, and Alberic.

<sup>5</sup> "Advenit optatus ceu bos tibi ductus ad aram  
Rex Hugo, Romanam potius commotus ob ur-  
bem,  
Quid juvat, o scelerata, virum sic perdere  
sanctum."

The sanctity of King Hugo! The  
naiveté of Liutprand is truly comic,  
betraying the motive, the possession of  
Rome, for this sacrifice!

have resented this devotion of his mother to her new foreign connexions. He was a youth of daring; he organized a conspiracy among the nobles of Rome; he appealed to the old Roman pride,—“Shall these Burgundians, of old the slaves of Rome, tyrannize over Romans?”<sup>h</sup>

A.D. 932.

At the tolling of the bell the whole people flocked to his banner; attacked the Castle of St. Angelo before Hugh could admit his own troops. Alberic remained master of the Castle, of his mother, and of the Pope. These two he cast into prison, defied the king of Italy, who made an ignominious retreat, and from that time remained master of Rome.<sup>1</sup>

For four years Pope John XI. lingered in fact a prisoner, at least without any share in the government of Rome, only permitted to perform his spiritual functions. Alberic ruled undisturbed. King Hugh attempted to bribe him to the surrender of Rome, by the offer of his daughter in marriage; the more crafty Alberic married the daughter, and retained possession of Rome. After the death of John, a succession of Popes, appointed, no doubt, by the sole will of Alberic,—  
Papal succession.  
 Leo, Jan. 936. Leo VII., Stephen IX., Marinus II., Agapetus II., pass over the throne of the Popedom, with  
Stephen, 939.  
 Marinus, 941. hardly a sign of their power in Rome, no indication of their dignity, still less of their sanctity; though they still are Popes beyond the Alps.<sup>k</sup>

Nor was the supreme Pontiff alone depressed in these turbulent times. The great ecclesiastics of Italy  
Great ecclesiastics of Italy.  
 are mingled up in most of the treacherous and bloody transactions of the period.<sup>m</sup> Individual energy gave the bishop of a city great power; but as they

<sup>h</sup> Liutprand. This loose writer, and Flodoard, whose adulatory phrases on the virtues and wisdom of each successive pope remind us of the proverbial mendacity of epitaphs, are still almost our sole authorities.

<sup>1</sup> Flodoard, in Chron. apud Duchesne.

<sup>k</sup> Leo sends a bull to the Archbishop of Hamburg; appoints the Archbishop of Mentz his legate, with full power to correct bishops and monks; makes grants and issues laws.—Regesta

apud Jaffé. Stephen interferes in France in favour of Louis d'Outre-mer. Marinus confirms the Archbishop of Mentz as his vicar. Agapetus, in a Council, condemns Hugh, Archbishop of Rheims.

<sup>m</sup> The obscenities which perpetually occur in the pages of the Bishop Liutprand betoken an age of profound corruption. The Italian character was now a strange fusion of lust and ferocity. The emasculation of their enemies was a common revenge.

acted with as little restraint, so these prelates were treated with as little reverence as secular princes. Landulf of Capua, and Athanasius of Naples, have already appeared in that strangely mingled character of the lawless Italian prince and the Christian prelate. Lanthbert had bought the archbishopric of Milan, by large bribes, from the Emperor Berengar. It was by his instrumentality that Burchard, Duke of Suabia, the father-in-law of King Rodolf of Burgundy, was surprised and murdered. Burchard, indeed, had given provocation; he had threatened to turn a church in the suburbs into a fortress, by which he would bridle the mutinous city of Milan.<sup>a</sup>

Hugh of Provence, now undisputed King of Italy, though ejected from and baffled before Rome, ruled supreme in Pavia, where he built a splendid palace. Hugh, throughout his reign, showed the utmost scorn of ecclesiastical, as of moral control. He had violated the law of marriage by his union with Marozia; as soon as he found it convenient he declared that marriage null, and married Alda, the daughter of King Lothair. On her death he again wedded Bertha, widow of King Rodolf of Burgundy, and in contempt of the canon A.D. 938. law, united her daughter to his son. No stern or ascetic prelate ventured to rebuke the promiscuous concubinage with which the King of Italy still further outraged public decency. He bestowed the great bishoprics according to his caprice. One of his bastards he made Bishop of Piacenza, another Archdeacon, or one of the Cardinals, with the hope of succession to the archbishopric of Milan.<sup>o</sup> Hilduin, his relation, expelled from his see in France, was raised to the archbishopric of Milan. Ratherius, a French monk, on account of his skill in the seven liberal arts, was made Bishop of Verona; this was contrary to the inclination of Hugh, who declared that Ratherius should bitterly lament his elevation. He cut him off with a very small

<sup>a</sup> Compare Verri, *Storia di Milano*, c. iii, p. 99, for the insulting language of Burchard, whom the Archbishop had honoured with the especial privilege of allowing him to hunt a stag in his park. Burchard expressed at once his admiration and contempt at the

height and strength of the walls of Milan.

<sup>o</sup> Liutprand, iv. 6. Teobaldo, his bastard by Stephanía, a Roman concubine of King Hugh. Verri, p. 101. Hugh formed a plot for the murder of Alderic the Archbishop; it was baffled.

stipend, and forced him to take an oath not to lay claim to any more of the revenues of the Church. On the seizure of Verona, by Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, who aspired for a short time to the empire, Ratherius, accused of favouring the usurper, was seized, deposed, and imprisoned at Pavia. Manasseh, Archbishop of Arles, the ungrateful favourite of Hugh, had been permitted to swallow up the bishoprics of Trent, Verona, and Mantua. This ambitious prelate, tempted by the higher offer of the archbishopric of Milan,<sup>p</sup> on the first opportunity, sought to betray his patron. He was master of the March of Trent, and, as Bishop, commanded the pass of the Alps. This pass he surrendered to Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, when he rose to supplant King Hugh in the dominion of Italy. Monasticism too was now at its lowest ebb. King Hugh granted the lands of abbeys, and even abbeys, like other lands, to his flatterers or his servants.<sup>q</sup>

Italy, which was soon weary of better kings, began to take steps for relieving herself of the oppressions of King Hugh. Conspiracies were formed with Transalpine sovereigns to contest the kingdom of Italy, first with Rodolf of Burgundy, whom Hugh bribed to peace by the surrender of part of his Provençal dominions. Then Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, descended the Alps, and occupied Verona. He retreated with discomfiture and disgrace.

At length arose a more formidable rival, Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, had married Willa, the daughter of Boso, King Hugh's brother, on whom the King had bestowed the dukedom of Tuscany. Jealous of his brother's wealth, and of certain splendid ornaments, in which Boso and his wife took great delight, Hugh despoiled his brother of the dukedom, which he then granted to one of his own bastards. Berengar had been suspected, with his brother Anschar, Duke of Spoleto, of dangerous designs against the king. Anschar took up arms and fell in battle. Berengar was then at

A.D. 936.  
Berengar  
Marquis of  
Ivrea.

<sup>p</sup> Quum miles esse inciperet, episcopus esse desinit. Thus writes Liutprand of Manasseh. Manasseh, in justification of his promotions, had profanely quoted to

Liutprand the translation of St. Peter from Antioch to Rome. Liutprand, iii. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Liutprand, iv. c. 3. Muratori, Ann. d'Italia, sub ann. 939.

the court of the king, who had determined to seize and blind him. Berengar received timely warning (it is said from Lothair, King Hugh's son, who reigned with conjoint authority), and fled beyond the Alps. A.D. 940.

There he remained till, almost summoned by the general discontent of the Italian princes, he descended the Alps as a deliverer. The great ecclesiastics were the first to desert the cause of King Hugh. Manasseh, on the promise of the archbishopric of Milan, opened Trent; Adelard, his officer, who commanded the fortress Fiumigara in that district, was rewarded for joining in his master's treason, by the promise of the bishopric of Como. Princes crowded around Berengar to obtain

castles or domains, ecclesiastics monasteries, or bishoprics. A.D. 946. Berengar dispossessed the spiritual as unscrupulously as the temporal sovereigns. He expelled Joseph from the see of Brescia; he broke his promise of the see of Como to Adelard, and gave it to Waldo, a lawless robber, who plundered the highways, and blinded his captives; to Adelard he gave the see of Reggio. He was only prevented by large bribes from dispossessing the Bishops of Parma and Piacenza. Guido, Bishop of Modena, had been gained to his party by the rich abbey of Nonantula.

Berengar was content to leave the title of King of Italy for a short time to Hugh and his son Lothair, while himself possessed the real power. Hugh, disgusted at his humiliation, speedily withdrew, with his enormous wealth, beyond the Alps, leaving the vain but perilous ensigns of royalty to his promising son. He died the year after his retirement. Lothair lingered on for three years in this inglorious

kingly servitude, and died, poisoned, as of course it was rumoured, by Berengar—by Berengar, whose life he had saved from the plots of his own father, Hugh of Provence—in the flower of his age. A.D. 950. Berengar and his son Adalbert became kings of Italy.

During the whole reign of Hugh of Provence, notwithstanding the open or treacherous assaults of that king, Alberic, whether as an armed tyrant, commanding Rome

from the Castle of St. Angelo, or as the head of a republic, and recognised by the voice of the Roman people, had maintained his authority. He had ruled for  
A. D. 963. twenty-two years; he bequeathed that authority, on his death, to his son Octavian.

Octavian, though only nineteen years old, aspired to unite, in his own person, the civil and spiritual  
Pope John XII.  
Nov. 965. supremacy. He was already in holy orders; two years after the death of his father Alberic, the Pope Agapetus II. died; and Octavian, by the voluntary or enforced suffrages of the clergy and the people, was elected Pope. He was the first of the Roman pontiffs who changed, or rather took a second ecclesiastical name; the civil government seems to have been conducted in that of Octavian; the Church was administered under that of John XII.

Berengar and his son Adalbert, kings of Italy, had made no attempt on Rome during the strong rule of Alberic; the youth of the new Governor and Pope tempted them to threaten the independence of the city, and to bring it within the sphere of their tyranny. Of that new tyranny Italy was now again weary. Berengar, his wife Willa, and his son Adalbert, are charged with acts of atrocious cruelty and oppression, in every part of their large dominions.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

## THE OTHOS ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

IN the mean time had arisen in Germany a monarch more powerful than had appeared in Europe since the death of Charlemagne. Otho the Great, of the Saxon line, had inherited a preponderating power in the North of Germany. He had greatly increased it by his own successes in war. The Danes, the Sclavonians, the Hungarians, had been subdued by his arms, or awed by the terrors of his victorious forces. All Germany submitted to his sway, or acknowledged his superiority. Already, some years before, the formidable Otho had made a descent on Italy; but his expedition was more that of an adventurous Paladin of later days for the deliverance of a captive princess, than the invasion of a mighty sovereign. That Princess had pretensions indeed to the kingdom of Italy. The beautiful Adelaide, the widow of King Lothair (the gallant but unfortunate son and heir of Hugh of Provence), had been cruelly persecuted after her husband's death, by Berengar, whose son Adalbert aspired to her hand. She had been stripped of all her jewels and costly raiment, beaten, her hair torn from her head, and plunged into a foetid dungeon.\* She made her escape, with the assistance of a priest, and took refuge under the protection of the Bishop of Reggio. That prelate entrusted her to the care of his brother, who held the strong castle of Canosa, in fee of that Church. Canosa defied the siege of Berengar and Adalbert. Otho, whose son Ludolf had already made a descent, not brilliantly successful, upon Italy, suddenly swept down from the Alps, rescued and married the captive princess. Berengar was obliged to open the gates of Pavia to the irresistible Otho.

A.D. 951.

\* So writes S. Odilo, Abbot of Clugny.—Vita S. Adelard. apud Canisium. Hroswitha de Gest. Odon.

Otho made some disposition for a visit to Rome to receive the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope Agapetus; but Alberic would brook no master. The Pope, at his dictation, declined to receive the dangerous stranger. Otho returned to Germany to suppress the menaced rebellion of his son Ludolf, who had taken offence at his father's second marriage. He was followed in the next year by Berengar and Adalbert, who stooped to receive the kingdom of Italy as vassals of the German Otho. They promised—no doubt the secret of their humiliation was the wide-spread discontent of their Italian subjects—to rule with greater equity and moderation.<sup>b</sup> But for four years Otho was occupied with

A.D. 962.

his German wars; and the tyranny of Berengar and his son weighed on the necks of his subjects with all its former burthen. The son of Otho, Ludolf, who had returned to the allegiance of his father, was first despatched with a great army to the deliverance of Italy. After having overcome all resistance, Ludolf died, by one account slain in battle by the hand of King Adalbert,

A.D. 967.

by another poisoned through the agency of Berengar; more probably of a fever. Berengar and Adalbert, who had cowered before the irresistible enemy, resumed their sway, and their tyranny was aggravated by revenge. The cry was again loud and universal for the interposition of the Germans.

The Church by its prelates was the first and most urgent in its supplications to the Transalpine for deliverance from her Italian tyrants. The Pope John XII., (Octavian), menaced by Berengar, sent two ambassadors of high rank on this important mission. The Archbishop of Milan, who had been dispossessed to make room for Manasseh of Arles, and Waldo, the deprived Bishop of Como, joined in the appeal. Many of the Italian princes were equally impatient for succour.

All Italy looked for the coming of the new Charlemagne. On his appearance resistance vanished. Be-

<sup>b</sup> Hroswitha de Gestis Oddonis :—

" Hunc Regem certè digno suscepit honore,  
Restituens illi sublatis culmina Regni,  
Ista percortè tantum sub conditione.

— seu subjectis jussis esset studiosus.

et  
Ut post hæc populum regeret clementis ipsum  
Quem prius Imperio nimium contrivit amaro."

rengar and Adalbert shut themselves up in their strongest fortresses. It was a triumphal procession to Pavia—to Rome. At Pavia Otho the Great was crowned King of Italy, at Rome the Pope anointed him as Emperor. Thenceforth the King of Germany claimed to be Western Emperor.\* Otho swore to protect the Church of Rome against all her enemies, to maintain her rights and privileges, to restore her lands and possessions, when he should have recovered them, and to make no change in the government of Rome without the sanction of the Pope. John XII. and the Roman people took the oath of allegiance to the Emperor; they swore more particularly to abandon all connexion with Berengar and his son. The oath was taken on the body of St. Peter.

A.D. 961-2.  
Arrived at  
Rome Feb.

A.D. 962.  
Purification of  
the Virgin.

Yet no sooner had the Emperor returned to Pavia, than the perfidious John, finding that he had unwarily introduced a master instead of an obsequious ally, began to enter into correspondence with Adalbert, who, driven from every Italian city, had found refuge with the Saracens. Rumours of this treason reached the Emperor. The noble German would not believe the monstrous perfidy; he sent some trustworthy officers to inquire into the truth; they returned with a fearful list of crimes, of license, and cruelty with which the son of Alberic, who seems entirely to have sunk the character of Pope in that of the young warlike, secular prince, was charged by the unanimous voice of Rome. The Emperor calmly replied, that the Pope was young, the counsel and example of good men would soon work a change. In the mean time Otho proceeded to besiege first Queen Willa in the castle San Giulio in the island of the Lago di Garda, then Berengar in his strong fortress of Monte Leone near Montefeltro.

Treachery of  
the Pope.

A.D. 962.

The Pope sent two legates to the camp of Otho to promise amendment, but at the same time boldly recri-

\* Otho of Freisingen says of the Emperor Otho: "Imperium Romanum virtute sua ad Francos orientales reduxit."—vi. 24.

"Quemcumque sibi Germania regem Prefuit, hunc dives submisso vertice Roma Suscipit."—*Gunther, in Ligur.*

Compare Eichhorn, *Deutsche Staats und Rechts Geschichte*, ii. p. 36.

minated on the Emperor, as having infringed on his part the solemn treaty. He had seized two of the Pope's vassals, and compelled them to swear allegiance to himself. Nor had he restored, as he had sworn, the dominions of the Pope. Otho condescended to reply that these men had been seized at Capua, on a mission to Constantinople, hostile to him; that at the same time others had been taken, who on pretence of a religious mission to the Hungarians,<sup>d</sup> were to incite those unbelievers to attack the dominions of Otho; that he had not restored all the Roman territory, only because he had not yet recovered it from the enemies of the See. The treason of the Pope, on the other hand, rested not on vague rumour; the whole correspondence with the Pope's signature and seal was in his hands. Otho sent two bishops, Landobard, a Saxon, and Liutprand of Cremona, to offer the Pope satisfaction as to the charges against his honour: either their own oath, or the wager of battle. His soldier would maintain the fair fame of the Emperor against any champion appointed by the Pope. The Pope, says Liutprand, not without manifest indignation, refused both the oath of the bishops, and the single combat of the warriors. King Adalbert, in the mean time, had emerged from his retreat among the Saracens, and appeared publicly in Rome. Otho marched at once upon the capital; the Pontiff had reckoned on the cordial support of the people; they recoiled; the Pope and Adalbert fled together from Rome.

July, 963.

The Emperor summoned an ecclesiastical council; it was attended by the Archbishops of Aquileia (by deputy), of Milan and of Ravenna; by two German, and two French metropolitans; by a great number of bishops and presbyters from Lombardy, Tuscany, and all parts of Italy. The whole militia of Rome assembled as a guard to the council round the church of St. Peter. The proceedings of the council mark the times. Inquiry was made why the Pope was not present. A general cry of astonishment broke forth from the clergy and the people—"The very

<sup>d</sup> The Legates to the Hungarians had letters, plumbo signatas, to exhort them, ut super Ottonem Imperatorem irruant. —Liutprand, Hist. Otton. c. 6.

Iberians, Babylonians, and Indians have heard the monstrous crimes of the Pope. He is not a wolf who condescends to sheep's clothing; his cruelty, his diabolical dealings are open, avowed, disdain concealment." The calmer justice of the Emperor demanded specific charges. The cardinal presbyter rose and declared that he had seen Pope John celebrate mass, without himself communicating. Another, that he had ordained a bishop in a stable; that he had taken bribes for the consecration of bishops, and had ordained a bishop of Todi who was but ten years old. "For his sacrileges, all eyes might behold them;" they alluded, probably, to the dilapidation of the churches, which were open to the weather, and so much out of repair, that the worshippers could not assemble from fear lest the roofs should fall on their heads. Trial of the Pope. Darker charges followed, mingled with less heinous, in strange confusion; charges of adultery, incest, with the names of the females, one his father's concubine, another a widow and her niece; he had made the Lateran palace a brothel; he had been guilty of hunting: charges of cruelty, the blinding one dignified ecclesiastic, the castrating another, both had died under the operation: he had let loose fire and sword, and appeared himself constantly armed with sword, lance, helmet, and breastplate. Both ecclesiastics and laymen accused him of drinking wine for the love of the devil; of invoking, when gambling, heathen deities, the devils Jove and Venus. He had perpetually neglected matins and vespers, and never signed himself with the sign of the cross.

The Emperor could only speak German; he commanded the Bishop of Cremona to address the assembly in Latin. Liutprand warned the council, he adjured them by the blessed Virgin and by St. Peter, not to bring vague accusations, or such as could not be supported by accredited testimony, against the holy father. Bishops, deacons, clergy, and people with one voice replied, "If we do not prove these and more crimes against the Pope, may St. Peter, who holds the keys of heaven, close the gates against us; may we be stricken with anathema, and may the anathema be ratified at the day of judgment!" They appealed to the whole army of Otho,

whether they had not seen the Pope in full armour on the other side of the Tiber; but for the river he had been taken in that attire.

Letters were sent summoning the Pope to answer to these accusations; accusations some of them so obscene, that they would have been thought immodest if made against stage players.\* If the Pope dreaded any assault from the enraged multitude, the Emperor answered for the security of his person. The Pope's reply was brief, contemptuous,—“John, the servant of God, to all the bishops. We hear that you design to elect a new Pope: if you do, in the name of Almighty God, I excommunicate you, and forbid you to confer orders, or to celebrate mass!”

Thrice was Pope John cited before the Council. Messengers were sent to Tivoli; the answer was, “The Pope was gone out to shoot.” Unprecedented evils demand unprecedented remedies. The Emperor was urged to expel this new Judas from the seat of the Apostle, and to sanction a new election. Leo, the chief John deposed, Dec. 4, 963. secretary of the Roman See, was unanimously chosen, though a layman, in the room of the apostate John XII.

But the army of Otho, a feudal army, and bound to do service for a limited period, began to diminish; part had been injudiciously dispersed on distant enterprises; the Romans, as usual, soon grew weary of a foreign, a German yoke. The emissaries of Pope John watched the opportunity, a furious insurrection of the people broke out against the Emperor and his Pope. The valour of Otho, who forced the barricades of the bridge over the Tiber, subdued the rebellion. He took a terrible revenge. The supplications of Leo with difficulty arrested the carnage. Otho soon after left Rome, and A.D. 964. marched towards Camerina and Spoleto in pursuit of King Adalbert. The Emperor Berengar and his wife Willa were taken in the castle of St. Leo, and sent into Germany.

Hardly, however, had Otho left the city, when a new

\* “Ut si de histrionibus dicerentur ‘Pharetratus jam in campestrum abierat.’”  
 vobis verecundiam ingererent.”

rebellion, organised by the patrician females of Rome, rose on the defenceless Leo, and opened the gates of the city to John. Leo with difficulty escaped to the camp of Otho. The remorseless John re-entered the city, resumed his pontifical state, seized and mutilated the leaders of the imperial party, of one he cut off the right hand, of another the tongue, the nose, and two fingers; in this plight they appeared in the imperial camp. An obsequious synod reversed the decrees of that which had deposed John. The Roman people had now embraced the cause of the son of Alberic with more resolute zeal; for the Emperor was compelled to delay till he could re-assemble a force powerful enough to undertake the siege of the city. Ere this, however, his own vices had delivered Rome from her champion or her tyrant, Christendom from her worst pontiff. While he was pursuing his amours in a distant part of the city Pope John XII. was struck dead by the hand of God, as the more religious supposed; others by a more natural cause, the poignard of an injured husband.<sup>s</sup>

Returns to Rome.

Feb. 964.

Feb. 27.

May 14, 964.

But it was a Roman or Italian, perhaps a republican feeling which had latterly attached the citizens to the son of Alberic, not personal love or respect for his pontifical character. They boldly proceeded at once, without regard to the Emperor, to the election of a new pope, Benedict V.

Otho soon appeared before the walls: he summoned the city, and ordered every Roman who attempted to escape to be mutilated. The republic was forced to surrender. Benedict, the new pope, was brought before the Emperor. The Cardinal Archdeacon, who had adhered to the cause of Leo, demanded by what right he had presumed to usurp the pontifical robes during the lifetime of Leo, the lawful pope. "If I have sinned," said the humbled prelate, "have mercy upon me." The Emperor is said to have wept. Benedict threw himself before the feet of Otho, drew off the sacred pallium, and delivered up his

<sup>s</sup> Other authorities, followed by Muratori, speak of a sickness of eight days.

crozier to Leo. Leo broke it, and showed it to the people. Benedict was degraded to the order of deacon, and sent into banishment in Germany. He died at Hamburg.

The grateful, or vassal pope, in a council, recognises the full right of the Emperor Otho and his successors in the kingdom of Italy, as Hadrian that of Charlemagne, to elect his own successors to the Empire, and to approve the Pope. This right was to belong for ever to the King of the Roman Empire, and to none else.<sup>h</sup>

Early in the next year the Emperor Otho re-crossed the Alps.<sup>1</sup> Leo VIII. died, and a deputation from Rome followed the Emperor to Germany to solicit the reinstatement of the exiled Benedict to the papedom. But Benedict was dead also. The Bishop of Narni (John XIII.), with the approbation or by the command of the Emperor, was elected to the papacy.<sup>k</sup>

In these dark times the form of a republic seems dimly to arise with magistratures bearing the old and venerable names of consuls, tribunes, and prefects. But whether it was a confederacy of the Roman barons in the city and the neighbourhood who usurped these functions, the titles of which had perhaps never been extinct, or a popular movement towards independence, it is difficult to determine. At all events, its avowed aim was to shake off the yoke as well of the Pope as of the Emperor.

Scarcely had John XIII. assumed the pontificate than the barons and the people began to murmur against the haughtiness of the new pontiff. They expelled him from the city with one consent. The Prefect Rotfred, not without personal insult to the Pope, assumed the government of Rome; for ten months John XIII. was an exile from his see, at first a prisoner, afterwards in freedom. From his retreat in Campania he wrote with urgent

<sup>h</sup> See the law in Pertz, Leg. ii. 167. The form of the Bull is thought suspicious; of the substance there is no doubt. —Jaffé, Regesta, p. 324.

<sup>i</sup> The Emperor Otho returned from Italy bearing many precious reliques,

and splendid marbles to adorn his noble church at Magdeburg.—Thietmar, ii. 10, 11. He was at Pavia Christmas 964.

<sup>k</sup> Otho created and disposed of bishoprics with full and unlimited powers. —Thietmar.

entreaty to the Emperor. Otho made the cause of John his own; for the third time he descended the Alps; the terror of his approach appalled the popular faction. In a counter insurrection in favour of the Pope, Rotfred the prefect was killed, and the gates opened to the pontiff; he was received with hymns of joy and gratulation.<sup>m</sup> At Christmas Otho entered Rome; and the Emperor and the Pope wreaked a terrible vengeance at that holy season on the rebellious city. The proud Roman titles seemed but worthy of derision to the German Emperor and his vassal Pope. The body of the prefect who had expelled John from the city was dug up out of his grave and torn to pieces. The Consuls escaped with banishment beyond the Alps; but the twelve Tribunes were hanged; the actual prefect set upon an ass, with a wine-bag on his head, led through the streets, scourged, and thrown into prison. All Europe, hardened as it was to acts of inhumanity, shuddered at these atrocities. The Byzantine Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, reproached the ambassador of Otho at Constantinople with his barbarity. Liutprand, though an Italian, was devoted to the Emperor and his cause: he haughtily answered, that his master had only punished, according to the imperial laws of Theodosius and Justinian, insurgents against the Empire and the Pope; he had scourged, executed, hanged, and banished these sacrilegious rebels<sup>n</sup> who had broken their oath of allegiance. If he had not done so, he had been impious, unjust, tyrannical.<sup>o</sup>

The rebellion was crushed for a time; during the five remaining years of John's pontificate the presence of Otho overawed the refractory Romans. He ruled in peace. At

<sup>m</sup> Continuat. Reginon. sub ann. 696.

<sup>n</sup> "Jugulavit, suspendit, exilio relegavit."—Liutprand. The emperors of Constantinople had never abandoned their pretensions to Rome and Italy. Nicephorus resented the allegiance demanded by Otho of the princes of Benevento and Spoleto, and his hostilities against the few remaining possessions of the Greeks in Southern Italy. He demanded restoration of the Exarchate

and of Rome, as the price to be paid for the hand of his daughter. The Romans will appear afterwards, more than once, in their desperation, turning for succour to the decrepit East.

<sup>o</sup> In the Legatio of Liutprand are some curious details on the Greek clergy. The passage often quoted from Liutprand about the degeneracy of the Romans refers to the *Byzantine* Romans.

his death the undisturbed vacancy of the See for three months implies the humble consultation of Otho's wishes (he had now returned to Germany) on the appointment of his successor.

The choice fell on Benedict VI., as usual of Roman birth. The factions of Rome now utterly baffle conjecture as to their motives, not the principles, but the passions which actuated their leaders. Twice, the second time, after an interval of ten years, during which he was absent from Rome, the same man, a Cardinal Deacon, seizes and murders two Popes; sets himself up as Supreme Pontiff; but though with power to commit these enormities, he cannot maintain on either occasion his ill-won tiara.

The formidable Otho the Great<sup>p</sup> died the year of the accession of Benedict VI.<sup>q</sup> Otho II., whose character was as yet unknown, had succeeded to the imperial throne;

he had been already the colleague of his father in the Empire. He had been crowned at Rome by Pope John XIII. On a sudden Bonifazio, surnamed Francone, described as the son of Ferruccio, a name doubtless well known to his contemporaries, seized the unsuspecting Pope Benedict and cast him into a dungeon, where shortly after he was strangled. Bonifazio

assumed the papacy; but he had miscalculated the strength of his faction, in one month he was forced to fly the city. Yet he fled not with so much haste, but that he carried off all the treasures, even the sacred vessels from the church of St. Peter. He found his way to Constantinople,

where he might seem to have been forgotten in his retreat. The peaceful succession of Benedict VII., the nephew or grandson of the famous Alberic, may lead to the conclusion that the faction of that family still survived, and was opposed to that of Bonifazio. The first act of Benedict, as might be expected, was the assembling a council for the excommunication of the murderer and anti-pope Boniface. This is the first and last im-

<sup>p</sup> "Post Carolum magnum regalem cathedram nunquam tantus patriæ rector atque defensor possedit." So writes

Thietmar of Otho I.

<sup>q</sup> He died May 7, 973.

portant act in the barren annals of Pope Benedict VII. Under the protection of the Emperor Otho II. he retained peaceful possession of the See for nine years,<sup>1</sup> an unusual period of quiet. He was succeeded, no doubt through the influence of the Emperor, by John XIV., who was no Roman, but Bishop of Pavia. But in the year of John's accession, Otho II. was preparing a great arma-  
ment to avenge a former defeat by the Saracens, he had been taken prisoner and released, he now threatened to bridge the Straits of Messina, and re-unite Sicily to the Empire of the West. In the midst of his preparations he died at Rome.<sup>2</sup>

A.D. 983.

Aug. 20, 984.

July, 985.

The fugitive Bonifazio Francone had kept up his correspondence with Rome; he might presume on the unpopularity of a pontiff, if not of German birth, imposed by foreign influence, and now deprived of his all-powerful protector. With the same suddenness as before, he appeared in Rome, seized the Pope, imprisoned him in the Castle of St. Angelo, of which important fortress he had become master, and there put him to death by starvation or by poison.<sup>3</sup> He exposed the body to the view of the people, who dared not murmur. He seated himself, as it seems, unresisted in the papal chair. The Holy See was speedily delivered from this murderous usurper. He died suddenly. The people revenged themselves for their own base acquiescence in his usurpation by cowardly insults on his dead body;<sup>4</sup> it was dragged through the streets, and at length buried, either by the compassion or the attachment, for Boniface must have had a powerful faction in Rome, of certain ecclesiastics. These bloody revolutions could not but destroy all reverence for their ecclesiastical rulers in the people of Rome. The Empire was vacant; Otho III.,

<sup>1</sup> Sismondi is probably right that *Domus* or *Domnus*, who is here inserted, was merely a title, *Dominus Benedictus*. This conjecture has the farther recommendation of giving the full nine (or near ten) years to the papacy of Benedict, according to the epitaph quoted by Baronius. Compare Jaffé, who quotes a work of Giesebrecht as conclusive.

<sup>2</sup> Richer, whose valuable chronicle the industry of Pertz has recovered, is very particular on the death of Otho II. He was suffering from indigestion, took 4 drachms of aloes, which brought on a bloody flux.—b. iii. c. 96.

<sup>3</sup> Chronic. Voltorn. apud Muratori, t. i. p. 11.—R. I. Hermann. Contract. sub ann. 984.

<sup>4</sup> Catal. Pap. apud Eccard.

though he called himself King of Germany and of Italy, had not yet assumed the imperial crown; and Otho was a youth who had but newly succeeded to his father.

The Roman Republic, crushed by the overwhelming power of Otho the Great, now again assumes a distinct form and regular authority; and at the head of this republic is the Consul Crescentius, by the ecclesiastical writers condemned as a sacrilegious usurper, in modern days hailed as the champion and the martyr of Roman liberty. By a probable, if not a certain, genealogy, Crescentius descended from that famous, or infamous, line of Theodora, Marozia and Alberic, who had so long ruled in Rome.<sup>x</sup> He was the grandson of Theodora and the Pope John of Ravenna; by the mother's side he was nephew of Alberic. Crescentius was Master of the Castle of St. Angelo, so lately possessed by the usurper Boniface (who may have been supported by the Roman party, the house of Alberic), and the Castle of St. Angelo commanded Rome.

John XV., a Roman, had succeeded peaceably on the death of Boniface.<sup>y</sup> But either the Pope disdained to submit to the supremacy of the Consul, or the Consul persecuted the Pope. John XV. was either driven from Rome, or retired into Tuscany. His complaints of his contumacious people were heard with favour by the King of Italy, the youthful Otho, whom the Pope tempted to Rome that he might receive the imperial crown. The Romans had too recent and bitter remembrance of the terrible vengeance exacted by the Germans

Sept. 965.

<sup>x</sup> Hoeffer, in his *Deutsche Päpste*, a panegyric rather than a history of the German popes, has ingeniously traced this genealogy of the Crescentii from the various epitaphs preserved by Baronius:—

"Corpore hic recubat Crescentius inclytus ecce,  
Eximius civis Romanus, Dux quoque magnus.  
Ex magnis magna proles generatur et alta  
Joanne patre, Theodora matre nitescens."

This was the Crescentius "caballi mar-morei" of Liutprand, vi. sub ann. 963; the Crescentius of Hermannus Contractus, who imprisoned and strangled Pope Benedict VII., A.D. 964. The great parents were Pope John X. and Theodora. This Crescentius had two sons: 1. John,

named by Hermann. Contract. sub ann. 689, as having slain the Prefect Rotfred. 2. Crescentius (Numantanus), the Consul. The elder Crescentius became a monk; and by this, and ample and exemplary donations to the Church, atoned for his sins—

"Se Domino tradidit habitum monachorum adeptus,  
Quod templum donis amplis ditavit et agris,  
Hinc omnia, quicumque legis rogitare memento,  
Ut tandem scelerum veniam mereatur habere."

He died July 7, 984.

<sup>y</sup> Another John, son of Robert, who ruled for four months, is inserted by some writers; but this John was called John XV.

for former revolts. The Pope was permitted to return; he was received with the utmost respect by the Consul and the Senate, whose powers he seems to <sup>A.D. 987.</sup> have recognised without reserve. John XV. ruled for a period of eleven years, in quiet possession of his spiritual, if not of his secular, supremacy. The great imputation on his memory implies an accommodating temper, which would not provoke danger by ill-timed pride. He is charged too with excessive venality.\* Possibly the Republic, in its usurpation of the papal power, may likewise have laid claim to some of the revenues of the Roman territory; the Pope may have been thrown back on his spiritual resources, and so justified to himself his extortions on the appellants to Rome.

But however Rome and the Roman people might depress the Pope, and keep him in subjection to the Consul and the Senate, the Pope had rarely been in these latter times a native but of Rome, at least of Italy. Rome heard with amazement, which it was constrained to suppress, and confusion which it dared not betray, that the Emperor had determined to unite in his own family, his barbarous German family, the Empire and the Papacy. Rome was not only to endure a foreign Emperor, but a foreign Pope. Christendom, in truth, would tolerate no longer the profound ignominy of the Papal See. There was still too much of true religion in the world to submit to such Popes as for nearly a century had profaned the throne of St. Peter. It was no insurrection of disobedience, nor of rebellion at the supremacy of the Roman See; it was an act of loyal reverence, of sincere respect. If Italy could not furnish more worthy pontiffs, Italy must forfeit her exclusive privilege. The determination might appear sudden, but it was the effect of moral indignation, which had been long fermenting in the hearts of men, and broke forth when it could no longer be pent up in silence.

The descent of Otho III. to Italy might seem a great ecclesiastical armament of the Transalpine clergy to rescue

\* Abbo, the pious Abbot of Fleury, *bus actibus suis venalem.*—Quoted in a pilgrim at Rome, describes him as Muratori, A.D. 996.  
“*turpis lucri cupidum, atque in omni-*

the papacy from its debasement, the Pope from being the instrument or the victim of the turbulent factions in Rome, from the notorious vices, the licentiousness, the venality, the intrigues, the ferocious bloodthirstiness, which had so long degraded the head of Christendom.\* Around the youthful Emperor, on whose face the first down of manhood began to appear, were assembled at Ratisbon the great dignitaries of the realm,—Willigis Metropolitan of Mentz, Harburg of Salzburg, the Bishops Hildebald of Worms, Widerold of Strasburg, Rotberd of Spire, Notker of Liège, Haimo of Verdun, Lambert of Constance, Gotschalk of Freisingen, Christian of Passau, Alawick Abbot of Reichenau. Gerbert the deposed Archbishop of Rheims, afterwards Pope Sylvester, was in the train.† Otho confessed himself to the saintly abbot, Romuald of St. Emmeran. And so the Emperor, environed by his hierarchical council, set forth amid the sound of bells and the chants of the clergy, men bearing the holy lance led the way.

Otho celebrated Easter at Pavia, and received the homage of the Lombard princes. He had arrived at Ravenna, where he was met by a message from the clergy, the senate, and the people of Rome, announcing the sudden death, by fever, of John XV., and humbly submitting to the wishes of the Emperor as to the appointment of his successor.

Otho at once proclaimed his determination to place his kinsman and chaplain Bruno, son of the Duke of Carinthia, on the vacant throne. Bruno was a youth of unblemished piety, of austere morals, morals ill suited for the state of Rome, and somewhat fiery temper. The Romans had gone too far to recede. The new Pope appeared in Rome, accompanied by Willigis of Mentz and Hildebald of Worms; he was received and consecrated with seeming joy. The more pious of the monks did not disguise their delight. "The news that a scion of the imperial house, a man of holiness, of wisdom, and virtue, is placed upon the chair of St. Peter, is news more precious than gold and

\* Vita S. Adalberti, apud Pertz.

† These names appear signed to an original document, dated Rome, May 24,

996, published by Höfer, *Zeitschrift für Archäologie*, i. 538.—Quoted by Gfrörer, p. 1481.

precious stones." So writes the holy Abbo of Fleury to his friend.<sup>b</sup>

Rome, overawed, had submitted to receive the Pope; the Pope was followed by the King of Germany, who received the imperial crown from the hands of Gregory V., the name assumed by the new Pope. The Emperor held a Council with the ecclesiastics, a Diet with the civil authorities of Rome. The Consul Crescentius was summoned to appear before the latter. (the Cæsar himself was on the tribunal), to answer for his offences. He was condemned to exile, but pardoned at the intercession of the Pope, who foresaw not how dangerous was his mercy. The Emperor exacted the vain homage of an oath of allegiance from the Romans to himself as Emperor, and an oath of fidelity to the Pope.

Otho withdrew from Rome and from Italy with almost as great rapidity as he had arrived;° with him departed the German prelates, whose followers perhaps had formed the greater part of the army, content with having achieved their great work, but having taken no measures to secure its permanence.

Gregory was left alone, to overawe as he could by the blamelessness of his life, his gentler virtues, the dignity of his spiritual character, the turbulent patricians and people of Rome, whom Crescentius had already roused and ruled by his eloquent reminiscences of their former liberties, of their republican glories; and Crescentius himself, who had already tasted the luxury of power. A year had not elapsed before the Pope was forced to fly from Rome, and reached Pavia in a state of utter destitution.<sup>d</sup> At Pavia he assembled a council of Italian bishops, and launched an excommunication against the rebel Crescentius; ignorant, in his own profound religious faith, how dead the Romans had become to these familiar terrors. Crescentius laughed to scorn the spiritual menace of an unarmed and unprotected pontiff.

<sup>b</sup> Mabillon, Act. Ord. S. Benedict. vi. 30.

<sup>c</sup> He was in Rome only till the end of May; in August, at Pavia; 15th Sept.

at Ingelheim.—Böhmer, Regesta Ottonum, p. 767.

<sup>d</sup> "Nudus omnium rerum."—Ann. Hildesheim, 996. Annalista Saxo.

Crescentius wanted an antipope, and an antipope soon offered himself: he was not a Roman, but, singular as it may at first appear, a Greek, at least a Calabrian, a subject of the Greek empire. At this juncture the ambassadors of Otho III. at Constantinople returned to Rome; among these was the Bishop of Placentia. Philagathus was a Calabrian of mean birth; his knowledge of Greek, still spoken in the parts of Southern Italy subject to the Greek Emperor, had recommended him to the notice of Theophania, the Byzantine wife of Otho II., the mother and guardian of Otho III. He had been employed in important affairs; had been ambassador more than once to Constantinople, where he had perhaps fostered the ambition, never yet extinct, in the Byzantine Emperor, of resuming his supremacy in Italy. The East, by the marriage of her princess with the Emperor of the West, had again become more mingled up with European affairs; but that connexion would be no bar to engagements with the Roman insurgents against the authority of the Western Empire.

Philagathus had obtained, it was said, by violent means the bishopric of Placentia: he had amassed great wealth by the plunder of that church, and was prepared with his wealth to be the anti-pope of the Roman republic. Crescentius and John XVI. agreed to divide the dominions of Rome; and, under the protection of the Greek empire, the one with the title of patrician or consul to administer the temporal, the other the spiritual affairs of the city. It cannot be supposed that Crescentius, whatever may have been the views of the subtle Greek Pope, had any serious designs of withdrawing Rome from its position as head of the Western Empire, or of restoring it to its dependence on the despised East.\* But in his desperation he caught at any alliance, and that alliance with the East was interpreted by the jealousy of the Germans as a deli-

\* Arnulf of Milan (apud Muratori, *Scrip. Ital.* iv.), said to have made accurate investigations into the history of Rome at that time, writes of John XVI.: "De quo dictum est, quod Romani decus Imperii in Græcos transferre tentasset.

Si quidem consulto et ope quorundam civium Romanorum, præcipuè Crescentii cujusdam præditiis Apostolicam sedem jam violenter invaserat, dejecto eo, qui tunc insederat, venerabili Papâ."—c. ii.

berate transference of his allegiance. History, in truth, is always seeking for policy, when passions (as is so often the case) are the ruling motives of men. And the ambition of Crescentius was a passion, rather than a calm and heroic aim; it was not content with the temporal power, under the subordinate title of patrician or consul; the asserter of the liberties of Rome (an extant medal confirms the statement of one, though but of one historian) himself assumed the empire.

But the new Emperor or Consul, and the Pope, to whom all agree in ascribing fox-like cunning, had strangely miscalculated their strength. No sooner was Otho released from the Sclavonian war in which he was engaged, than he appeared in Italy<sup>1</sup> at the head of an overwhelming force of Germans and Italians; Italy was prostrate before him. He reached Rome, he entered Rome without the least resistance. Pope John made his escape, but was taken and brought back. The most horrible punishment was inflicted on the traitor to the Empire, the usurper of the Papal See. His eyes were put out, his nose and his tongue cut off, and in this state, it is said by the command of the hard-hearted Pope himself, he was paraded through the streets on an ass with his face to the tail, and the common form of mockery,—a wine-bladder on his head.<sup>2</sup>

Crescentius shut himself up in the Castle of St. Angelo, and for a short time defied the Emperor. He was at length persuaded to capitulate; but the perfidious Otho ordered him to be beheaded with twelve of his leading partisans; their bodies were hung with their heads down-

<sup>1</sup> 997. He was at Pavia, Jan. 5, 998.

<sup>2</sup> Thietmar, iv. 21. "Gregorius V. . . . apprehendere fecit illum scelestum invasorem, et fecit ei oculos eruere et nasum cum lingua abscindere et in asello sedere faciens Roman fecit eum circumduci, cum utro in capite."—Chronicon. Estens. apud Muratori, S. L. iii. 2, p. 337. Compare Cat. Pontif. Eccard iv. Acta S. Nili. That holy hermit is there said to have interceded for the life of his wretched compatriot. The Emperor consented; but the savage Pope was not yet satisfied. ὁ δὲ ἄγριος Πάππας λαῖνος, μὴ χειράρετος ἐφ' οἷς ἵσταται εἰς τὸν ἀσφαλτοῦρα φιλόγαλον, tore his dress from him,

and then ordered him to be paraded through the city, as in the text. Out of this Höfler has made a religious romance about the Pope's indignation at John's wearing the dress of a priest, not of a penitent (as if the poor blinded and mutilated prisoner could choose his dress). With more flagrant dishonesty, he attributes the cruelty of the Pope to the Roman people. Nilus, a Greek it is true, predicted the wrath of God both against Pope and Emperor. On the same authority (Acta S. Nili) rests the pilgrimage of Otho to Mount Garganus to expiate his cruelty towards John XVI.

ward round the battlements of the castle.<sup>b</sup> So, says the historian, turbulent Rome was awed to peace before the Emperor.<sup>1</sup>

But if Rome could not defend, it could revenge itself.

Feb. 999.

The German Pope enjoyed his recovered dignity hardly a year, and that not without disturbance; he was cut off in the flower of his age, as it was commonly believed by poison. Crescentius, too, was fearfully avenged: how avenged the close of three or four years will show, neither to the honour of the Emperor, nor of Rome.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Rudolphus Glaber has an incredible story of Crescentius appearing before the Emperor, and being allowed to re-enter the castle.

<sup>1</sup> "Sic Roma ante mobilis regis quievit in oculis."—Arnulf.

<sup>k</sup> "Sed post discessum ejus (Ottonis III.) a Romanis expulsus, ac deinde

veneno peremptus est."—Vit. S. Meinwerchi, c. 10. Compare Acta S. Nili. Gfrörer, with his marvellous felicity for discerning recondite villanies, attributes Gregory V.'s death to his successor!! whom he calls the "serpent of Ravenna"—die Schlange zu Ravenna!"—p. 1507.

## CHAPTER XIII.

## OTHO III. POPE SILVESTER II.

GREGORY V. had died, but the youthful Emperor Otho lived, revolving magnificent schemes of empire, and little foreseeing the fate which awaited him so speedily in Rome, the object and the centre of his ambitious designs. The first Millennial period of Christianity was drawing to its close. In many parts of Christendom there prevailed a deep and settled apprehension that with the thousandth year of Christ the world would come to an end. That last day, when Christ would return to judge the world; the day which, since the times of the Apostles, the more profoundly religious, especially in periods of more than usual darkness and calamity, had beheld as immediately at hand, as actually bursting upon the world, could not delay beyond this fatal period. The vague but awful language of prophecy had dwelt in strong terms on the period of a thousand years, as if divinely appointed to enclose certain phases of human history; and many of the most dreadful predicted signs (never wanting to those who seek for them with the sagacity of terror), the wars and rumours of wars, above all the want of faith upon the earth, might seem to justify these cowering apprehensions of the timid—the triumphant anticipations of the most ardent and hopeful believers. At the beginning of the century, the end of the world had been announced by a grave council.<sup>a</sup> The end of the world is at hand, was publicly preached at Paris.<sup>b</sup> Men hastened to propitiate the coming, almost present judge, by the sacrifice of their ill-gotten, now

<sup>a</sup> See Gieseler, *Lehrbuch*, 2, 1, p. 267. Michelet, *Hist. des Français*, lib. iv. c. 1, sub init. “Dum jam jamque adventus imminet illius in majestate terribili ubi omnes cum gregibus suis venient pastores in conspectum pastoris æterni.”—*Concil. Trosleian.* sub ann. 909.

<sup>b</sup> Abbo, the Abbot of Fleury, had heard this sermon in 990.—*Galland*, xiv. 141. “Æstimabatur enim ordo temporum et elementorum præterita ab initio moderans secula in chaos decidisse perpetuum, atque humani generis interitum.”—*Radolf. Glaber*, l. iv. 39.

useless possessions. The deeds of the time, the donations of estates, and of all other gifts to the Church, are inscribed with the significant phrase, the end of the world being at hand.<sup>o</sup>

But while these fears were lurking in the hearts of pious but obscure men; while they were darkening the dreams of holy recluses, and dictating the wills of penitent sinners trembling on the brink of the grave; the great men of Europe, the secular and ecclesiastical potentates entertained no timid misgivings as to the duration of the world. In Italy, in Rome the centre of Italy, these terrors were unknown; the Emperor himself, instead of apprehending the close, looked to the opening of the new Millennium but as the dawn of a Western Empire, as vast and comprehensive, more firmly established, and more stably organised than that of Charlemagne. Otho had imagined the re-establishment of the Roman Empire, with Rome for its capital.<sup>d</sup> In all the hopefulness of youth, in the pride of an imperial descent for three generations, he resolved the vast but impossible scheme of restoring Rome to her ancient authority as the seat of empire.<sup>e</sup> The reformation of the clergy by the renovated power of the Pope, the correction of that notorious avarice and venality for which Rome was already infamous,<sup>f</sup> was to be accomplished by the appointment of a Supreme Pontiff truly apostolic in his character. The two great powers, the spiritual and the temporal, each working in his separate sphere, were to dwell together in the same eternal metropolis, and give laws, wise and holy and salutary laws, to Christendom.<sup>g</sup> Rome might seem to

<sup>o</sup> "Appropinquante mundi termino."

But compare Dr. Todd's Donnellan Lectures, who curiously traces the expectation of the final judgment through every century. Dr. Todd denies that the clergy encouraged the donations of land—"appropinquante mundi termino"—more about the year 1000 than at other times. It is a question hardly capable of proof.

<sup>d</sup> "Imperator antiquam Romanorum consuetudinem jam ex parte magna deletam suis cupiens renovare temporibus, multa faciebat, quæ diversi

diversè sentiebant."—Thietmar, iv. 29.

<sup>e</sup> "Româ solum quam præ ceteris diligebat ac semper excolebat, exceptâ."—30.

<sup>f</sup> "Tota Italia Roma mihi visa est; Romanorum mores mundus perhorrescit."—So had written Gerbert, Epist. 40, apud Duchesne, ii. 728. Gerbert was to know more of Rome. Thietmar writes of Rome: "Corruptis autem pecuniâ cunctis primatibus maximèque Romanis quibus cuncta sunt venalia."—iii. 5.

<sup>g</sup> "Eodem tempore imperator Romam profectus in antiquo palatio, quod est

have cast a spell upon the mind of the Teuton; it was on the Aventine Hill that he conceived and brooded over this great vision; he dismissed his German followers; he returned hastily, having appointed the new Pope, to Germany: in Germany it was observed, not without jealousy, that he was environed by Italians.

Yet as if too his mind was not exempt from that holy awe which prevailed in other parts of Europe, the conduct of Otho during his short residence in Germany had a serious and melancholy character. <sup>A.D. 1080.</sup> He made a pilgrimage to Gniesen, to the grave of Adalbert, the Apostle of Bohemia, the friend of his youth; he entered the town as a penitent, with discrowned head, and naked feet. At Quedlinburg he celebrated Easter with his sister, the holy Abbess Adelheid. At Aix-la-Chapelle, in obedience to a dream, he commanded the grave of the great Teutonic Emperor of the West, Charlemagne, to be opened. The body was found seated on a golden throne in royal apparel, with a crown of gold and jewels, and the sceptre in his hand. Otho took a cross of gold from his neck, and some part of his raiment, and commanded the tomb to be again closed over his imperial predecessor. This singular ceremony, this investiture, as it were, by the dead Charlemagne, at all events, this association of the two great names, coincided with the visionary ambition of Otho, and with the specific object of that ambition.

Nor was the successor of Gregory V. a man to despair of the future fortunes of the world, to acquiesce in dreaming and indolent prostration of mind in the approaching termination of human affairs. Gerbert had gradually risen by his great abilities, his sagacity in ruling the minds of men; his learning, which awed his age; his unimpeachable morals, and his character for profound piety, through all the successive steps of ecclesiastical advancement to the second see in the West.

in Monte Aventino, versabatur, et sicut juvenis tam viribus audax quam gerere potens, magnum quiddam ibi et impossibile cogitans, virtutem Romani Imperii ad potentiam veterum Regum ad tollere cona-

batur. Mores etiam ecclesiasticos quos avaritia Romanorum pravis commercationum usibus vitiabat, ad normam prioris gratiæ reformare æstimabat."—Chron. Camerac. c. 114, apud Bouquet, x. 296.

Gerbert was born near Avrillac in Auvergne, of obscure parentage. He was received into the school of the Clugniac Abbey at Avrillac. The abbot Gerald admired the indefatigable thirst for knowledge and the fervent piety of the youth, who felt himself born for great purposes. It happened that Borel, the Count of Barcelona, visited the monastery; he took the youthful student with him into Spain. There the zeal of Gerbert did not prevent him from profiting by the mathematical science and advanced knowledge then exclusively possessed in Europe by the Mohammedan schools.<sup>1</sup> He is said to have visited Cordova, where the Omniade Caliph, Hakim II., held his splendid court, and patronised the peaceful arts and sciences. But the learned and scientific studies of Gerbert, so far beyond his age, were not those of a recluse and contemplative monk; nor did his Arabian skill in arithmetic, geometry, and astrology perhaps rather than astronomy, fall under the suspicion with which they were looked upon in later legend, as forbidden and magic arts. Gerbert must be archbishop and Pope, and incur all the hatred inevitable during contentious times in such high functions, before he is branded as a necromancer. With Count Borel, and with Hatto, Bishop of Vich, in Catalonia, Gerbert visited Rome.<sup>2</sup> There he attracted the notice of the Pope (John XII.) and of the Emperor Otho I. By Otho he was recommended to Adalbero, Archbishop of Rheims. He taught in the school of that city, the ecclesiastical metropolis of the Franco-Gallic church. He accompanied the Archbishop Adalbero again to Italy in the expedition of Otho II. That Emperor bestowed on him the famous Abbey of Bobbio.

But if the Italian manners of Rome shocked the piety of Gerbert, the turbulent and intriguing monks of Bobbio gave him no peace. Their poverty and nakedness distressed the Abbot. Former abbots had wasted, had even

<sup>1</sup> His Geometry is said to indicate Arabian sources of knowledge.

<sup>2</sup> It was during this expedition that he had his curious disputation (the first

scientific scholastic disputation) with Otric the Saxon. See the remarkable details in Richer.

alienated the estates of that once splendid foundation of St. Columban.<sup>m</sup> The neighbouring nobles who had obtained possession of the lands of the abbey demanded the ratification of their usurped rights.<sup>n</sup> Gerbert was persecuted; accused before the Emperor and the Empress Adelheid. He fled to Rome, with nothing left but his pastoral staff, and his apostolic ordination. But the Pope, trembling for his own life, could give him no protection; and the death of his patron Otho II. left him utterly defenceless. He abandoned Italy lest there he should be obliged to join the enemies of Otho.<sup>o</sup> He returned to Rheims to live under the patronage of Archbishop Adelbero. For ten years<sup>p</sup> he taught in the school of Rheims the whole range of human science;<sup>q</sup> at the same time he acted as secretary to the Archbishop; in the Archbishop's name and in his own maintained a constant correspondence with Adelheid, the widow of the elder; with the Greek Theophania, the widow of the second, and mother of the third Otho.<sup>r</sup>

The great but almost silent revolution was now taking place which raised the house of Capet to the <sup>Rise of</sup> throne of the effete race of Charlemagne. Hugh <sup>Hugh Capet.</sup> Capet received the crown of France from the hands of the Archbishop of Rheims.<sup>s</sup> His son Robert was consecrated by the same holy prelate. On the death of Archbishop Adalbero, a few months after, the metropolitan throne

<sup>m</sup> "Cum videam monachos meos attenuari fame; premi nuditate . . . nescio quibus codicibus, quos libellos vocant, totum Sanctuarium Domini venundatum est. Collecta pecunia nunquam reperitur; apothecæ et horrea exhausta sunt: sed in marsupiiis nihil est."—Gerbert, Epist. ad Othon. Imper. Compare Epist. iii. to the Bishop of Tortona. Epist. iv., v., and xii., *et seqq.*

<sup>n</sup> Epist. xx.

<sup>o</sup> See the five first of Gerbert's epistles, apud Bouquet.

<sup>p</sup> This probably includes his former residence and teaching.

<sup>q</sup> Richer is diffuse on the whole course of Gerbert's lectures. They comprehended rhetoric, logic, music, geometry, astronomy. He explained the poets Virgil, Statius, Terence; the

satirists Persius, Juvenal, Horace; the historian Lucan. Richer describes the "sphere" of Gerbert, and the Abacus, seemingly as wonders, yet unknown north of the Pyrenees. M. Haureau (*Hist. de la Philosophie Scholastique*) seems to think rather more highly of Gerbert's treatise *De Rationali et Ratione Ut* (published by Pez, *Thes. Anecd. v. i.*) than the authors of the *Hist. Littéraire*, and M. Cousin, p. 154.

<sup>r</sup> Curious notices of books, especially of science, as well as historical facts, are scattered throughout Gerbert's letters; but they sadly want a critical editor.

<sup>s</sup> On the election of Hugh Capet, read the speech of Archbishop Adalbero, repudiating the notion of hereditary right to the crown.—Richer.

of Rheims might seem, like that of the Roman pontiffs, to have become the mark of secular as well as of spiritual ambition. But the contest for this hierarchical dignity, with no less violence and treachery, had something of feudal character. Adalbero, according to Gerbert, had bequeathed to him the care, the primate had hoped the succession to the See.<sup>1</sup> But it was too valuable a prize to be surrendered at once to a low born man, however the most distinguished in Christendom for learning and science. Arnulf, a bastard son of the royal house of France, the falling Carlovingian house, aspired to the dignity. The bastardy was a blot in the ecclesiastical escutcheon, but might be washed off by the mystic sacramental power of the Church.<sup>2</sup> Hugh Capet, from some unknown policy, supported the pretensions of Arnulf: he appeared at Rheims, and though he affected to leave the free election to the clergy and people, disguised not his own inclinations. Arnulf's oath of fidelity to Hugh Capet, couched in terms of more than usual severity of imprecation, has been preserved by a contemporary writer.<sup>3</sup> Arnulf took the sacrament on this oath, and observed it—a few months. Arnulf was seized with compassion for his own despoiled and injured House. Hugh Capet became a usurper. The gates of Rheims were opened to Charles of Lorraine, the head of the Carlovingian party. The archbishop at first pretended total ignorance of his own act; he was at length compelled to throw off the mask. Gerbert, also, had discovered the wrongs of the Carlovingian house.<sup>4</sup> He is

<sup>1</sup> "Taceo de me, cui nullæ (mille) mortes intendebantur; et quod pater noster Adalbero me successorem sibi designaverat, cum totius cleri, et omnium episcoporum, ac quorundam militum favore."—Epist. cl. ii.

<sup>2</sup> "Sed tamen hæc mater ecclesia purificans mysticis abluit sacramentis." See the proclamation of Arnulf, written by Gerbert, Epist. ii. 1. Hugh Capet does not seem to consider the bastardy a blot: he commends Arnulf to the citizens of Rheims as "divæ memoriæ Lotharii ex concubina filius."—Richer, lib. iv.

<sup>3</sup> "Quod ei imprecatur pro felicibus

contumeliosa, pro salutaribus pernicioſa, pro honestis turpia, pro diuturnitate punctum, pro honore contemptum; et, ut totum concludatur, pro omnibus bonis omnia mala."—Richer. This valuable work of Richer was first discovered and published by Pertz. It has been re-edited and translated by the Historical Society of Paris.

<sup>4</sup> "Patruo igitur miserescibat; illum cogitabat; illum colebat; illum pro parentibus carissimum habebat, apud quem collato consilio quærebat quonam modo in culmen honoris provehere possit, sic tamen ut ipse regis desertor non appareret."

become, as though indispensable in that office, the secretary of Arnulf, as he had been of Adalbero. In a letter to Bishop Adalberon or Ascelin, of Laon, he addresses him as his dear friend, and acknowledges how deeply he is mingled up with plots, conspiracies, litigations, secular affairs. "Why should this wrong be inflicted on the elder house? why is it dispossessed of the throne?"

King Hugh Capet sent ambassadors to Rome to demand the deposition of the perfidious and rebellious Arnulf. Heribert, Prince of Vermandois, with Charles of Lorraine, the chief of the Carolingian faction, appeared in person on the other side. Heribert brought more cogent arguments; it was not only a beautiful white palfrey which he presented to the Pope, but more solid gifts in other quarters, to Crescentius, Lord of Rome. The ambassadors of King Hugh stood unhonoured and unheard at the doors of the Vatican. Gerbert was in dire perplexity. With unconscious effrontery he confides his own double dealing to his friend the Archbishop of Treves. Difficulties of Gerbert. He had pledged himself to King Hugh; he trembled at the power of Charles of Lorraine, still, with Arnulf, master of Rheims. But on the side of Hugh Capet were the offers of the education of his son Robert, and the archiepiscopate.<sup>a</sup> He sent his letter of repudiation to Arnulf, yet with strange simplicity he entreated Arnulf to take under his special care certain houses which he had built in Rheims.<sup>b</sup> He had now discovered that Arnulf had been raised by simoniacal, and therefore heretical means. Arnulf's apostacy from his lord the king reveals all his diabolical wickedness; he becomes aware that Arnulf was a plunderer, a spoiler, not an administrator

<sup>a</sup> "O felix quondam et dulcis amice sub imperio patris mei Adalberonis! . . . Ille ego qui sub imperio beatæ memoriæ patris mei Adalberonis militaveram in scholâ omnium virtutum. Nunc regiam incolo aulam, cum sacerdotibus Dei vitæ verba conferar (conferam?). Nec ob amorem Karoli aut Arnulfi diutius passus sum fieri organum diaboli . . . pro mendacio."

<sup>a</sup> "Pervenit, beatissime Pater, gladius usque ad animam. Hinc fide promissi Regibus Francorum urgemur, hinc po-

testate Principis Karoli, regnum ad se revocantis adducti, permutare dominos aut exules fieri cogimur."—Epist. xiv. In another letter: "Dicimus tacenda, tacemus dicenda; agimur quod volumus, quod volumus nequimus."—Epist. xi. He consoles himself that he never actually *swore* allegiance but to the Emperor Otho: "Nulli mortalium unquam aliquando juris jurandum præbui nisi D. M. Othoni."

<sup>b</sup> "Libellus repudiî."—Epist. xxiv.

of the See. Gerbert's perceptions may have been quickened by the synod of French bishops at Senlis, which declared the monk priest Adelgar, who had opened the gates of Rheims to Charles of Lorraine, under the ban of the Church and the Bishops of Rheims and Laon out of communion.

The betrayal of Arnulf by Adalberon of Laon into the hands of King Hugh Capet is a scene of treachery and impiety unparalleled even in those days. Adalberon, as Gerbert's letter shows, had been but now on the Carolingian side. He was the prelate accused of adulterous intercourse with Emma, wife of King Lothair; his widow, it was asserted by some, through poison administered by her episcopal paramour.<sup>c</sup> Charles of Lorraine and Arnulf the Archbishop were committed to several prisons.

King Hugh Capet waited not his tardy, it might be unsuccessful appeal to Rome. A council was instantly summoned in the monastery of St. Basolus at Rheims. The Archbishops of Sens and Bourges, eleven bishops, a great number of abbots took their seats; they sate as feudal nobles, as well as prelates of the Church, to adjudge the crime of treason, as well as to depose the Metropolitan. The long formal procedure for the degradation of Arnulf contrasts with the easy and rapid transference of the kingly power from the Carolingian to the Capetian dynasty. To depose an Archbishop of Rheims was an affair of difficulty and intricacy, compared with the dethronement of a king of France.<sup>d</sup>

Arnulf beheld confronted before him Adelgar the priest who had opened the gates of Rheims to Charles of Lorraine. Adelgar swore that the keys had been confided to him for the express purpose of the treason by the Archbishop. "Whoso believes me not on my word, I

\* It is just to observe that Richer relates the death of Lothair as natural. See also the pathetic letter of Queen Emma to the Empress Adelheid: "My hope was in my son (Louis le Faincant, now dethroned by Hugh Capet); he is become my enemy. . . . They have invented infamous charges against the Bishop of Laon."—Richer, iv. 61.

<sup>d</sup> The acts of the Council of Rheims were drawn up by Gerbert. Baronius pours forth a torrent of indignation against him, whom even the papal dignity does not exculpate from the sin of having presumed to deny or to limit the pontifical power in this Council.

am ready to satisfy by the ordeal of fire, by boiling water, or red-hot iron." Bishop Guido of Soissons bore witness against the Metropolitan. A more revolting, a nameless charge was brought against the falling prelate by Rayner, his private secretary. Arnulf shuddered: he was permitted to retire with the Archbishop of Sens and three bishops. These prelates returned to the council, declaring that Arnulf, smitten in the conscience by God, had fallen at their feet, confessed his sins, and acknowledged that he ought rightfully to be deposed from the dignity which he had unworthily assumed. The other prelates were not content without being witnesses of his humiliation. Nor were they satisfied with this; they brought him before the people; they forced him to stammer out his consent to his own degradation. Nor was this all: they would preclude the reversal of their sentence by bold anticipative defiance of the interposition of Rome. Arnulf, Bishop of Orleans, in the name of the king, delivered doubtless in the words of Gerbert, a long elaborate harangue, which amounted to the renunciation of all allegiance to the pope; the declaration of independence, if not of superiority to the Italian pontiff. It spoke, as Gerbert might justly speak in all the pride of pre-eminent science and learning, of the profound ignorance of Rome. "There is not one at Rome, it is notorious, who knows enough of letters to qualify him for a doorkeeper; with what face shall he presume to teach, who has never learned?" It spoke of the gross venality of Rome. "If King Hugh's ambassadors could have bribed the pope and Crescentius, his affairs had taken a different turn." It recounted the revolting crimes which for the last many years had sullied the papacy. The crimes of John XII. (Octavian), who had cut off the nose and the tongue of John the Cardinal; of Boniface, who had caused John XIII. to be strangled; starved John XIV. to death in the dungeons of the Castle of St. Angelo. "To such monsters, full of all infamy, void of all knowledge, human and divine, are all the priests of God to submit; men distinguished throughout the world for their learning and holy lives? The Roman pontiff who so sins against his brother, who often

Speech of  
Arnulf of  
Orleans.

admonished refuses to hear the voice of counsel, is as a publican and sinner. Though he be seated on a lofty throne, glittering with purple and gold; if he be thus without charity, thus puffed up by vain knowledge, is he not Anti-Christ? He is an image, an idol, whom to consult is to consult a stone.”<sup>c</sup> Towards the close, the Bishop of Orleans speaks with a kind of lofty compassion, and vouchsafes as it were a few words of reserved respect for Rome. “Worthy, or unworthy, we will respect her edicts, if the welfare of the realm be not thereby endangered.” Significant words follow: “She has already lost the allegiance of the East; Alexandria, Antioch, Africa, and Asia are separate from her; Constantinople has broken loose from her. The interior of Spain (here we recognise Gerbert) knows nothing of the Pope. The orator not obscurely applies those titles, under which the Pope was long after designated by his foes; not only Anti-Christ, but also the Man of Sin, the Mystery of Iniquity.” Had visions crossed the bold mind of Gerbert of a kind of Transalpine papacy at Rheims? If so, disappointment came upon him with his greatness. For the council, not content with the degradation of Arnulf, placed Gerbert on the vacant cathedral throne.

The form of Gerbert's election is remarkable. It is by the bishops, who complain that on a former occasion they were compelled by popular clamour, popular clamour that once cried, “Crucify him, crucify him!” to make an unworthy choice. It was no boy whom they now deliberately chose; but a man of mature age, known to them from his youth; of profound learning and piety. Gerbert's confession of faith is still more extraordinary. On the Trinity, and other points of doctrine, it is elaborately orthodox. He adds: “I prohibit not marriage; I condemn not second marriages. I do not blame the eating of flesh. I acknowledge that reconciled penitents should be admitted to communion. All sins original, as well as voluntary, are washed away by baptism. I believe no one can be saved out of the Catholic church. I confirm the four great councils.”<sup>d</sup>

<sup>c</sup> Concil. Remens. sub ann. 991.

<sup>d</sup> Gfrörer, with his customary too great

ingenuity, makes out of this convenient adulation to the family of Hugh Capet

Gerbert had been advanced, unwillingly, if his own words are to be credited, to the archiepiscopal see. But his election was unpopular; the people were indignant at the bishops assuming the election; the severity of his morals offended the looser clergy; the want of birth was an inexpiable delinquency with the high-born prelates. He was accused as having betrayed, imprisoned his master, and violated his spouse, that is, usurped his church.<sup>a</sup> Adalberon, the perfidious Bishop of Laon, envied the advancement of Gerbert; he entered into negotiations with the German Court of Otho (from which Gerbert by throwing himself into the interest of Hugh Capet had undesignedly estranged himself) to dethrone his rival. Theophania, the Greek Empress mother, or the boy Emperor, Otho III., demanded a legate from Pope John XV. to reverse the iniquitous sentence pronounced against Arnulf, and the promotion of Gerbert. <sup>Fall of Gerbert, A.D. 995.</sup> It was time for the Papal See, even at its lowest state of degradation, to assert its trembling authority, to assert that authority at the summons, and therefore under the protection of the imperial house of Saxony. Leo, the abbot of St. Boniface in Rome, appeared as the papal legate to adjudge this great cause, with the Bishops of France and Germany. <sup>A.D. 991.</sup>

On the first menace of the papal interference, the French prelates who met at a place called Chela, seemed resolute in the assertion of their liberties. But the papal legate was a man of courage and ability equal to the occasion. The Roman abbot Leo promulgated an answer to the harangue of the Bishop of Orleans at Rheims.<sup>b</sup> This remarkable document (but lately come to light) strikes in its outset at Gerbert as the author of the speech of the Bishop of Orleans. "The acts of your synod, which have been delivered to me, fill me with abhorrence.

<sup>a</sup> a design to throw off the Pope, and assert the absolute independence of the Gallican Church. The clergy were to be won by the permission of marriage. It reads to me more like a renunciation of Manicheism, which Gerbert may have thought necessary or expedient.—Gfrörer, p. 1462.

<sup>b</sup> "Ut major fiat invidia, obloquitur,

Dominum tuum tradidisti, carceri mancipasti, sponsam ejus rapuisti, sedem pervasisti."

<sup>b</sup> It has been published by Pertz. *Monumenta Germaniæ*. iii. 686.—Hoeck's *Life of Gerbert* was written before the publication of this, and of Richer.

Truly is the word of the Lord fulfilled in you, 'There shall be many anti-Christ's;' so know we that the last day is at hand. Christ, who cannot lie, has said that the blessed Peter is the foundation of your churches, yet say your anti-Christ's that in Rome there is now but a temple of idols, an image of stone. Because the vicars of Peter and their disciples will not have for their teachers a Plato, a Virgil, a Terence, and the rest of the herd of philosophers, who soar aloft like the birds of the air, or dive into the depths like the fishes of the sea; ye say that they are not worthy to be doorkeepers, because they know not how to make verses. Peter is indeed a doorkeeper—but of heaven." Thus abbot Leo repels the charge of ignorance; to that of gross venality his answer is certainly not that of Italian address. "Did not the Saviour receive gifts of the wise men?" He does not deny the crimes charged against Popes, but urges the warning example of Ham, accursed for uncovering his father's nakedness. He asserts that the prerogative of the See of Rome is from God himself; it cannot be annulled, or transferred to any other see. To the asseveration of the revolt of Asia, Africa, and Spain from the Roman See, he avers that it is utterly false, declares that ambassadors from Alexandria, Jerusalem, Carthage, Cordova, have but lately paid homage, and consulted the See of Rome.

Whether through the presence or the arguments of the papal legates, the countenance of the Court of Otho, the interests or the apprehensions of Hugh Capet of France (he died the next year), Gerbert stood alone at Moisson before a synod of but a few German prelates,<sup>1</sup> Ludolf of Treves, Notkar of Liege, Siegfried of Munster, Haimo of Verdun. The papal legate sate in the centre. The Bishop of Verdun, as understanding it might seem alone among these Teutonic bishops, the Gaulish, the Roman tongue, opened the session. Gerbert made an eloquent speech, but to an adverse court. The legate pronounced the sentence of interdict from communion, and from the exercise of his epis-

A.D. 995.

A.D. 996.

<sup>1</sup> Concilium Moisson., compared with the last chapters of Richer.

copal functions. Gerbert boldly overwhelmed them with citations from the canons, that such interdict against a man convicted of no crime was illegal. The council adjourned the final decree.

Gerbert contemplated further resistance. The future Pope in a letter to the Archbishop of Sens utters these un-Roman doctrines,—“Rome cannot make lawful that which God condemns, nor condemn that which God has made lawful. Rome cannot expel from her communion him who is convicted of no crime. The papal decrees are only of force when they concur with the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Prophets, and the genuine canons of the Church.”\*

But deserted by all, shunned as under interdict,<sup>m</sup> he thought it wisest at length to bow before the storm. He retired from France to the court of the Emperor Otho. There however, degraded from his archiepiscopate, it might seem through the imperial interest, Gerbert ceased not to be the most distinguished ecclesiastic for knowledge and erudition north of the Alps, perhaps in Christendom. He resumed all his old honour and respect; the court of Otho was proud of his presence; the spell of his powerful mind was cast on the young and ambitious Otho. One step towards the height of power had been made, and he had fallen back; he was ere long to make the other two.<sup>n</sup>

We return from this long but necessary episode, the life of Gerbert, to the magnificent schemes of Otho III. for the restoration of the empire in its transcendent Cæsarean power to Rome; of the popedom in its boundless, but strictly spiritual dignity.

Gerbert was now again free to follow with undivided devotion the fortunes of the Imperial House. France had cast him off: he was the vassal of Otho. He

Gerbert,  
Archbishop  
of Ravenna.

\* Epistol. Arch. Senonen.

<sup>m</sup> Compare his letter to the Empress Adelheid: “Memini enim meos conspirasse non solum milites, sed et clericos, ut nemo mecum comederet, nemo sacris interesset.”—Epistol. c. 411. A third rival candidate for the archiepiscopate was in the field, Gebuin.

<sup>n</sup> Read the skilful letter to the Em-

peror Otho: “Scio me divinitatem in multis offendisse et offendere.... Tribus ut ita dicam sæculi ætatibus vobis, patri, avo, inter hostes et tela fidem purissimam exhibui.”—Epistol. xxx. The famous lines are ascribed to Gerbert himself. Scandit ad R. (Rheims) Gerbertus, ad R. (Ravenna) Post, Papa viget R. (Rome).

joined the great assemblage of prelates, and accompanied his imperial master to Italy. There the Archbishop of Ravenna having retired to monastic seclusion, Gerbert, though a Transalpine, was raised at once to the second see of Italy.<sup>o</sup> On the death of Gregory V. Otho could find no prelate so likely to enter into, or to carry out (if Gerbert's influence had not first suggested, and constantly kept alive) his magnificent visions, as the man who stood alone as the most eminent prelate of his age, in learning

Gerbert  
Pope. peerless, in piety unimpeachable, Gerbert of Ravenna. Gerbert took the significant name of Silvester II., the new Silvester of the new Constantine.

The decree for the election of Gerbert issued by the Emperor develops the designs of Otho and of his Pope. In the name of the Holy Trinity, Otho the servant of the Apostles, by the will of God the Saviour, Emperor of the Romans: "We declare Rome to be the capital of the world, the Roman Church the mother of the churches; but the dignity of the Roman Church has been obscured by her neglectful and ignorant pontiffs; they have alienated the property of the Church without the city to the dregs of mankind<sup>p</sup> (these were the feudatory princes of the Roman States), made everything venal, and so despoiled the very altars of the apostles. These prelates have thrown all law into confusion; they have endeavoured to retrieve their own dilapidations by the spoliation of us; they have abandoned their own rights to usurp those of the empire." He denounces the donations of Constantine and of Charlemagne as prodigal and unwise; he assumes the power not merely of electing, but by God's grace of creating and ordaining the Pope. Finally, he grants eight counties to the Pope—Pesaro, Fano, Senigaglia, Ancona, Fossambruno, Osimo, Cagli, and Iesi.<sup>q</sup>

But ungrateful Rome seemed loth to enter into the lofty

<sup>o</sup> Gregory V. grants the pall to Gerbert, as Archbishop of Ravenna, April 28, 998.

<sup>p</sup> See the *comminatorium* of Gerbert to the neighbouring barons, whom he accuses of slaying priests, robbing the Church and the poor.—*Epist.* ii. xli. Gerbert had the high satisfaction of magnanimously condescending, as Pope,

to reinvest his old rival Arnulf in his full archiepiscopal rights and honours.—*Epist.* ii. lv. Dec. 999.

<sup>q</sup> The decree names only seven: Pisaurum, Fanum, Senigalliam, Anconam, Fossimbrunum, Gallihesem, Ausimum. Is the last but one made out of Cagli and Iesi?

schemes of the Emperor for her aggrandisement; the presence and the power of the Emperor did not overawe her conflicting factions. The feudatory nobles of the neighbourhood might well resent the denunciations and suspect the power of their new lord. Tusculum broke out in rebellion; the lord of that city was the kinsman of Crescentius and the ancestor of that line of counts who in the next century created and unmade popes. Tusculum was compelled to yield to the overpowering force of Otho: but on his return to Rome Otho found the gates closed. He ascended a tower near the walls, addressed the people in the prophetic language of expostulation, reminded them of his attachment, of his plans for their aggrandisement. They yielded probably rather to the terror of his arms than to the force of his eloquence. The gates were opened, and again they swore allegiance to their irresistible sovereign. But at this very moment the dire tragedy was hastening to its close. No Nemesis more awful ever darkened the stage of Greece. Stephanía, the wife of Crescentius, had, on his fall, been abandoned to the brutal lust of the German soldiers.<sup>Rome revolts.</sup> With stern self-command she suppressed her indignation, her loathing, within her heart. At the end of three years she had nursed up her fatal beauty to its old exquisite lustre. Otho himself, the religious Otho, was caught in her toils, which she spread with consummate art. She scrupled not to ascend the bed of her husband's murderer. With Stephanía vengeance was cheaply bought at such a price. She feigned the passionate love of a mistress, till the opportunity came of administering a subtle poison.<sup>Stephanía.</sup> In Italy such poisons were too well known, and here there seems convincing evidence to the truth of this crime, throughout Italian history always suspected, always cre-

"Stephanía autem uxor ejus traditur adulteranda Teutonicis."—Arnulf, c. 12. Höfler kills her of this ill usage.

"Incidit in insidias mulieris male, cujus virum Crescentium jusserat capitalem subire sententiam, quam formæ elegantissimæ nimis insipienter thoro suo socians, ab eâ veneno intra cubiculum dormians, infectus est."—Vit.

S. Meinwerce apud Leibnitz, i. p. 521. Compare Ann. Saxo. Leo Ostiensis, Landulf senior, Radulph Glaber. The modern German writers, zealous for the honour of Otho, seem inclined to doubt this story. Muratori accepts it. It seems to me to rest on as good authority as most events of the time.

dited, yet rarely with stronger proof than suspicion. The hand of death was upon the bright, hopeful youth. He withdrew from Rome, either expelled by a new insurrection secretly guided by Gregory of Tusculum, or with his constitution shattered by the poison administered through the hand of Stephania: he withdrew, not to collect his faithful troops and crush the rebellious city, but as a penitent to deplore and expiate his sins. His countenance was still cheerful to his faithful adherents; but his time was spent in tears, in prayer, in almsgiving. Already had he made a pilgrimage in the preceding year to atone for his perfidious execution of the Consul Crescentius, and his cruelty to Pope John XIV. Heaven, it is to be hoped, was more merciful than the wife of Crescentius. Deeply must Otho, cut off at the age of twenty-two years, have rued his fatal connexion with Rome, which neither terror could control, nor the hopes of her restoration to glory propitiate to a Transalpine sovereign. The world, especially the Transalpine world, deplored the untimely fate of this promising prince, who seemed destined for nobler ends. Rome might seem to crown her wickedness by this last unequalled crime.<sup>4</sup>

The faithful Pope Silvester had followed the Emperor in his retreat from Rome; he returned to Rome after his death. But Gerbert had seen three generations of Saxon Emperors expire in sad succession: the next year he followed them to the tomb." Popular rumour attributed, if not his death, yet a grievous malady, to the same remorse-

<sup>4</sup> Höfer has published a curious popular poem on the death of Otho, and the election of Henry II. The following are stanzas:—

"Quis dabit aquam capiti?  
Quis succurret pauperi?  
Quis dabit fontes oculis?  
Lacrymosis populis  
Sufficientes lacrymas (as)  
Mala mundi plangere?  
Ad triumphum ecclesie?  
Cecidit Otto crescere:  
Sumat Otto imperium  
Ut florescat sacculum:  
Vivo Ottone tertio  
Salus fuit populo.  
\* \* \*

Plangat ignitus Oriens,  
Crudus ploret Occidens:  
Sit Aquilo in cinere,  
Placatus in Meridie.

Sit mundus in tristitia,  
Nostra luge cithara.

Plangat mundus, plangat Roma,  
Lugeat Ecclesia.  
Sit nullum Romæ canticum,  
Uolet palatium.  
Sub Cæsaris absentia  
Sunt turbata secula."

*Beitrage*, xvi. p. 331.

On the other hand Bonizo, the Bishop of Sutri, expressing no doubt a strong Italian feeling of the time, condemns Otho to hell, for his cruelty to Pope John of Ravenna: "Domino odibilis sine vitico vitam finivit . . . Quo mortuo et in infernum sepulto."—*Liber ad Amic. iv.*

"Otho died Jan. 22, 1002; Silvester, May 12, 1003.

less Stephania. He is said to have lost his voice by poison, which she contrived to have administered to him.\* Such were the crimes believed in those days to be perpetrated, if not actually perpetrated, on holy Popes and on Emperors: all the magic art which fame attributed to Gerbert furnished no antidote. But Pope Silvester, throughout the following ages, was remembered with a kind of awful misgiving, with shuddering horror, lest the throne of St. Peter should have been occupied by a necromancer, by one whose wonderful powers could only have been attained through a compact with the Evil one.†

\* "Veneficio ejusdem mulieris etiam Papa Romanus gravatus asseritur; ita ut loquendum amiserit."—Ann. Saxo.

† William of Malmesbury is full on the magical arts and enchantments of Gerbert. He stole his book of glamour; his miserable death is the indubitable proof that the accusations of magic and doing homage to the devil are true (pp. 275, 284). Such was the belief in remote Britain. A more brief funeral oration cannot be imagined than that in the Vit. Pontif. Ravennat.: "Homagium diabolo fecit et male finivit."—p. 207.

But compare Hist. Lit. de la France and Vincent of Beauvais in the Encyclopædia of the Middle Ages. Gerbert in Spain, the land of necromancers, fell in love with the daughter of one of those accursed doctors: he stole his books. The magician, by the aid

of the stars, pursued the robber. But Gerbert too had learned to read the stars. By their counsel he lay hid under a bridge, through the arches of which rushed the roaring waters. The devil descended, and bore him away on his wings beyond the sea; with the design of establishing at a future time, by an awful delusion, one of his own abhorred supporters on the chair of the chief apostle.

Modern readers will be more struck with wonder at Gerbert's organ, which went by *steam*: "Ipse Gerbertus fecit arte mechanica horologium et organa hydraulica, ubi mirum in modum, per aquæ calefactæ violentiam, implet ventus emergens concavitatem barbatî (barbiti?) et per multos foratiles tractus æræ fistulæ modulatos clamores emittunt."—Vincent Bellov. Spec. Hist. xxiv. c. 98.

## CHAPTER XIV.

## THE TUSCULAN POPES.

THE first attempt to rescue the papacy from the hands of the turbulent patricians or fierce populace of Rome, to open to the whole Western Church the appointment to the supreme headship of Western Christendom, had ended in failure. Nearly another half century must elapse before Transalpine Christendom, by asserting her right of supplanting a line of degenerate Italian pontiffs by men more worthy of the high office, shall compel Italy, in her turn, to bring forth and to train men who, by their commanding abilities, win back the lost tiara, and revenge Italy for her temporary obscurity by reducing beneath her feet the rebellious Teutonic Church and even the Western Empire.

Three undistinguished popes, John XVII., who lived less than six months after his election, John XVIII., and Sergius IV., ruled for ten years of obscurity.<sup>a</sup> The contest for the kingdom between Ardoïn, Marquis of Ivrea, whom the Italians had chosen on the death of Otho, and the Emperor Henry II., was decided in the north of Italy. All the great prelates of the north espoused the imperial interest<sup>b</sup>—Tibald, Marquis and Archbishop of Ravenna, the Bishops of Modena, Verona, and Vercelli openly maintained, the Archbishop of Milan, the Bishops of Cremona, Piacenza, Pavia, Brescia, and Como hardly disguised their inclinations to, the same cause. The Pope alone seems to have stood aloof in unregarded insignificance. Rome, abandoned to herself, had resumed her republican constitution. The family of Crescentius had risen again to power. John, the son of the beheaded consul,<sup>c</sup> whether through the prevailing interest of Stephania, or by the solicitude of Otho to win popularity in

<sup>a</sup> John XVII., June 13, Dec. 7, 1003;  
John XVIII., Dec. 25, 1003, June, 1009;  
Sergius, July, 1009, died 1012, June 16.

<sup>b</sup> Adelbert in Vit. S. Henrici.

<sup>c</sup> See the genealogy in Höfler.

Rome, had been created prefect of the city under the Emperor. On Otho's death he assumed the title of Patrician, and ruled the city and the Popes with arbitrary power.<sup>d</sup>

But adverse, as it may be safely conjectured, and rival to the lineal descendant of Crescentius, had risen the Counts of Tusculum. These counts were <sup>Counts of Tusculum.</sup> also descended from Marozia and Alberic, and closely connected, being a younger branch of the same family with the house of Crescentius. The Counts of Tusculum had resisted Otho III. in the zenith of his power. A strong faction in Rome were jealous of the Tusculans, and reproached Otho for his blind clemency in not razing to the ground that dangerous and rebellious fortress, which was in too close neighbourhood to Rome. Possibly a temporary junction between these two great rival houses led to the perilous state of things, which induced the dying Otho to leave the impracticable, if not insurgent city. The Counts of Tusculum seem to have attached themselves to the new Imperial House which succeeded to that of Saxony. They governed Rome by less violent means than the Crescentii, whose power they gradually supplanted; they bought the venal people, and appointed Popes by the most open simony. The Papacy became an appanage of their family; they had almost succeeded, had they not blindly abused their influence, in rendering it hereditary. Three Popes in succession from this powerful family became the heads of Christendom.

The first of these, Benedict VIII., did not ascend the throne without opposition. Gregory, an antipope, <sup>Benedict VIII.</sup> was set up by the adverse party, possibly by the patrician Crescentius. Benedict fled for protection and support into Germany to the Emperor Henry II., who had now made great progress in the reduction of Ardoyn, his rival for the kingdom of Italy. The price of protection was the usual one—the gift of the imperial crown in Rome. But some peaceful revolution, brought about possibly by the terror of the Emperor, or the reconciliation of the Counts of Tusculum with John the Patrician (the Crescentius), permitted Benedict to return to Rome and

<sup>d</sup> "Destructor Apostolicæ sedis."—Thietmar, A.D. 1012.

resume his full pontifical rights.\* When Henry II. appeared in Rome, Benedict received him, according to ancient usage, on the steps of St. Peter's. The Patrician John showed all outward signs of homage to the Transalpine, laid splendid presents at his feet, and made more splendid promises; yet in secret he endeavoured, but in vain, to impede the coronation of the Emperor.<sup>f</sup>

Emperor  
Henry II.

Nevertheless the coronation took place.<sup>g</sup> Henry displayed and exercised all the rights of sovereignty, coined money with his own superscription, and administered justice in his own name. Benedict ruled in peace; John Crescencius still held the office of Prefect of the city; Alberic, the brother of the Pope, was Consul and Senator,<sup>h</sup>

July, 1014.

yet even from a Crescentius, described as son of Count Benedict, he wrested estates, which, when Consul, he had seized, belonging to the famous monastery of Farsa: the Consul was summoned before the Pope's tribunal; for Benedict wanted neither ability nor courage, at least that of a secular prince. By his activity and personal prowess a powerful armament of Saracens, which had landed in the territory of Pisa at Luna, was attacked and cut off almost to a man. The king only escaped; the queen was taken; her head-dress of gold and jewels, worth 1000 pounds, was sent as a present by the Pope to the Emperor

A.D. 1016.

Henry. The indignant Saracen, it is said, sent a large bag of chesnuts to the Pope, with a billet, "I will return with as many valiant Saracens to the conquest of Italy." The undaunted Pope sent him back a bag of millet. "As many brave warriors as there are grains will appear at my bidding to defend their native land."<sup>i</sup> The Pope more than maintained his lofty language: his

\* The time of Benedict's return is unknown to Muratori. In 1012 he is granting privileges to German prelates. He was at a synod with the Emperor at Ravenna, Jan. 1014. His return must then have been in 1012.

<sup>f</sup> "Apostolicæ sedis destructor, munibus suis et promissionibus phaleratis regem palam honoravit, sed Imperatoriæ dignitatis fastigium eum ascendere multum timuit, omnimodisque id prohibere clam tentavit."—Thietmar, 1014.

<sup>g</sup> The coronation the 24th or 14th of Feb. Muratori, sub ann. 14 Feb. Jaffé.

<sup>h</sup> Compare a Placitum published by Mabillon, Ann. Benedict. sub ann. 1016.

<sup>i</sup> Thietmar, vii. 31. Muratori conjectures the king to have been Mugello, who had possession of Sardinia. His summons to the troops was "ut inimicos Christi secum circumferant." The Pope claimed the queen's head-dress, the "spolia opima, aurum capitale, ejusdem (reginæ) ornamentum Papa sibi præ ceteris vindicavit."

legate was sent to Pisa and to Genoa, urging those cities, now rising into mercantile importance and power, not to endure the possession of an Italian island by the unbeliever. The united forces of these two cities expelled the Saracens from Sardinia, but they quarrelled about the spoil. The Pisan annalist claims the investiture of the island by the Pope for his city, which retained the sovereignty.<sup>k</sup> Benedict maintained his amicable relations with the Emperor Henry II. The Pope visited the Emperor at Bamberg; during the next year the Emperor descended into Italy. The Pope and the Emperor had a common enemy, the Greeks of Apulia and the south of Italy. The Greeks, seconded by the Prince of Capua and some of the southern chieftains, had taken the aggressive; in possession of Capua they would have threatened Rome herself. At this time Rodolf, a Norman, with some few followers, half adventurers driven from their native lands, half pilgrims to the shrine of the apostles, appeared at Rome. The martial Pope enlisted them in his cause, garrisoned with them the strong fortress on the Garigliano; the forces of the Emperor overran Apulia. His general, Poppone, Archbishop of Aquileia, besieged and took Capua; the prince was at the mercy of Henry, who hardly respected a safe conduct given by the Archbishop of Cologne. Troja, after an obstinate siege, surrendered. Henry was prepared to wreak his revenge on the city: he was melted to tears by a saintly hermit coming forth from the gates with the children of the city in procession, chanting Kyrie Eleison! The Emperor and the Pope visited together the monastery of Monte Casino. The Emperor was relieved from excruciating pains, which he was suffering, by the intercession of St. Benedict: he rewarded the saint by ample donations to the monastery.<sup>m</sup>

On the death of Benedict VIII., the Tusculan house by the same quiet but unresisted influence, undisguised

<sup>k</sup> Annali Pisani, p. 107.

<sup>m</sup> Radulf. Glaber. The religious Pope, with the religious Emperor, at a synod at Pavia, passed decrees strictly prohibiting the growing usage of the marriage of the clergy; no clerk might have

wife or concubine; no bishop have a female in his dwelling; the sons and daughters of clerks were slaves of the Church; anathema on him who adjudges them to be free.—Pertz, Leges. ii. 561.

bribery, elevated the brother of Benedict, a layman and prefect of the city, to the papal throne.<sup>a</sup> The Emperor Henry II. died in the course of the same year. For nine uneventful years the power which had created, maintained John XIX. in peaceable possession of the papal throne. Between three and four years elapsed before the son and successor of Henry II. could journey to Rome to receive the Imperial crown.<sup>a</sup> His coronation was the important affair of the Pontificate of John. It was attended (so great was still the reverence for Rome in the remoter parts of Europe) by two pilgrim kings, present to behold the eternal city, and to do homage to the chair, to the religion, to the successor of St. Peter. These were Rudolf III. of Burgundy, and Canute the Danish king of England. The ceremony did not pass off without tumult. A fierce fray took place between the barbarous and undisciplined Germans and the turbulent Romans; it ended in a great slaughter of the Romans; the leaders were compelled to appear before the haughty Emperor in the garb of penitents, with naked feet; the free men with their swords unsheathed, the slaves with osier cords round their necks, as if deserving to be hanged.<sup>o</sup> Another tumult more characteristic broke out between two Eriberts, archbishops of Ravenna and Milan. Each claimed the privilege of standing at the right hand of the Emperor. The decision, as might be expected, was against the Prelate of Ravenna, the old traditionary antagonist of the Pope. Eribert of Ravenna boldly took the place; the Prelate of Milan wished to avoid an open rupture; the Emperor, by the advice of the Pope, withdrew his hand from that of the Archbishop, and summoned the Bishop of Vercelli to his right hand. But Eribert of Ravenna still persisted in his right: the followers of the two archbishops came to blows, and the Ravennese was obliged to fly. A council asserted the right of the Archbishop of Milan, but Ravenna defied the decree both of Pope and council.

<sup>a</sup> "Uno eodemque die et laicus et pontifex fuit."—Romualdæ. Salern. Chron. S. Muratori. It. vii. "Qui uno eodemque die præfectus fuit et Papa." This

clause had been erased, but was restored in the MS. of Bonizo.

<sup>o</sup> Wippo, Vit. Conrad Salici.

The hereditary papacy in the House of Tusculum, if it had debased the Holy See by men of rapacity and violence, had yet maintained the peace of Rome for twenty years, and their Popes as secular princes had not been wanting in energy and vigour: now as though their object had been to reduce it to the lowest contempt, or as if, although the older and more able branches of the family disdained or would not submit even to the outward restraints of the office, nevertheless they would not allow the dignity to depart from their house; by their irresistible gold they secured the Pontificate for a boy not more than ten or twelve years old, the nephew of his predecessors, Benedict and John.<sup>p</sup>

Jan. 1033.

Benedict IX. had all the vices of a youth born to uncontrolled power; the Papacy had to endure the evils without the counteracting advantages of hereditary monarchy. In Italy, more especially in Rome, this transmission of the grace of the priesthood, or the spiritual power of the Supreme Pontificate through the worst and most licentious of mankind, seemed to jar on no strong religious sensitiveness, to rouse no general remonstrance of indignation; no vice could interrupt the descent of power imparted, according to its own proper theory, for the extirpation of vice: so entirely had that which was outward and formal prevailed over the inward and moral conception of Christianity. Beyond the Alps, at least in the remoter parts of Western Christendom, the individual Pope was merged in his office. The revolutions in Rome disturbed not the ideal sanctity with which the religious imagination arrayed the successor of St. Peter. In some cases the writers in Germany, though ecclesiastics, seem to have been ignorant of the name of the ruling Pope. For twelve years Benedict IX., under the protection of his powerful kindred, ruled in Rome, in the words of one of his successors, Victor III., leading a life so shameful, so foul, and execrable, that he shuddered to describe it.<sup>q</sup> He ruled like a captain of banditti, rather

Benedict IX.

<sup>p</sup> "Puer ferme decennis, intercedente thesaurorum pecuniâ, electus extitit a Romanis."—Radolfus Glaber, iv. c. 5.

<sup>q</sup> "Benedictus ille nomine, non factis, cujusdam Alberici filius (Magi potius Simonis, quam Simonis Petri vestigia

than a prelate; adulteries, homicides perpetrated by his own hands, passed unnoticed, unrevenged; for the patrician of the city, Gregory, was the brother of the Pope: another brother, Peter, an active partisan. Once, according to one doubtful authority, he had been already expelled, but replaced by the Emperor Conrad the Salic.<sup>1</sup> The oppressed people at length grew weary of his robberies, murders, and abominations. They rose and drove him from the city, and proceeded to the election of John,

A.D. 1044.  
April 10.

Bishop of Sabina, who took the name of Silvester III. But they had sold themselves to the Tusculan tyranny, and were not permitted to shake it off; the Consuls were partisans, doubtless kindred of the Pope; Benedict returned in triumph; the anti-Pope retired in disgrace and excommunicated to his bishopric. Benedict himself grew weary of his office, or despaired of maintaining it, or perhaps put it up to auction with no intent of fulfilling the contract. According to another by no means inconceivable story,<sup>2</sup> he was deeply enamoured of his cousin, the daughter of Gerard de Saxo (of the rock), master perhaps of some strong hill fortress. The father refused his daughter, unless the Pope would surrender the papacy. He actually sold the papacy to an arch-

Sale of the  
Papacy.  
Gregory VI.

Presbyter, named John,<sup>3</sup> of the same house, who assumed the name of Gregory VI. John, the arch-Presbyter, was a man of learning for his day, of unimpeachable chastity, now become in Rome so rare as to be called an angelic virtue; by his own admission he had heaped up enormous wealth, which he intended to dedicate to pious uses: among these pious uses (according to this Didius Julianus of the Papacy) was his own advancement. Not only did he pay a large sum to Benedict himself, he confessed the purchase of the suffrages of the people: it was a pious use to restore the right of

sectatus) non parvâ a Patre in populum profligatâ pecuniâ, summum sibi sacerdotium vindicavit. Cujus quidem post adeptum sacerdotium vita quam turpis, quam fœda, quam execranda extiterit, horresco referre."—Victor III., Dialog. lib. iii. apud Mabillon, Act. S. S. Benedict, sec. iv.

<sup>1</sup> Radolphus Glaber, sub ann. 1038.

<sup>2</sup> Bonizo, ad ann.

<sup>3</sup> "Joanni Archipresbytero non parvâ ab eo acceptâ pecuniâ, summum sacerdotium tradidit."—Victor III., Dialog. lib. iii. "Ejusdem pontificatus per cartulam refutavit Johanni suo patrino."

election to its lawful owners. Such acts ascribed to Gregory VI. throw some light on these times of darkness and confusion. It is natural to inquire into the sources of this enormous wealth by which the Counts of Tusculum had so long retained the Roman people in their pay. It is probable that the papacy was enslaved by its own wealth: that this powerful house had obtained by forcible or fraudulent alienation large parts of the estates of the Church. Gregory had bought the papacy; but it was not a barren and impoverished see which he coveted.\* He devoted himself immediately to the recovery of the ecclesiastical possessions at the point of the sword; and to the suppression of another great source of revenue to the turbulent barons of Rome and the neighbourhood, the plunder of the pilgrims to Rome. These pilgrims, who still flocked on with unwearied zeal to the Holy City, arrived, instead of opulent and munificent votaries at the sacred shrines, but miserable and plundered beggars. So entirely was Pope Gregory occupied in these achievements, that the Roman people gave him a colleague to officiate, when he was engaged in war, within the Church.†

There were now three Popes, by themselves or by their factions engaged in deadly feud. They had laid aside, or had taught each other to despise, their spiritual arms; they encountered with the carnal weapons of ordinary warfare. For Benedict had not obtained his bride. Gerard de Saxo had joined the faction of Silvester III. Benedict's brother would not brook the obscurity of the house of Tusculum: they brought back, not unreluctant, the abdicated Pope and reinstated him on his throne. Benedict held the Lateran,

Three Popes.

\* It is strange enough to find Peter Damiani (he was but young) rejoicing in the accession of Gregory VI. as the future extirpator of simony. "*Latantur cœli . . . conteratur jam milleforme caput serpentis: cepit commercium perversæ negotiationis: nullam jam monetam falsarius Simon in ecclesia fabricet Dei.*"—*Epist. i. 1.* Compare *Epist. ii.*

† According to William of Malmesbury, on Roman affairs no high authority, these sanguinary occupations of the Pope disqualified him in the eyes of the

Romans for his holy office. The Romans would have been the last to take offence at such exploits in a Pope. But a strong anti-Tusculan party may have felt so much interest in the recovery of the estates of the Church from those lawless barons, and in the security of the roads, by which the pilgrims might reach Rome with their wealth, that they may have acquiesced in the Pope's discharge of his sacred functions by a deputy.—William of Malmesb. lib. ii.

Gregory Santa Maria Maggiore, Silvester St. Peter's and the Vatican.

Christendom could not longer be ignorant of, or endure this state of things. Peter the Archdeacon of Rome, commissioned by the vows and prayers of a great number of the clergy, the monks, and more devout people, crossed the Alps, and threw himself at the feet of the Emperor, imploring his succour. The Emperor Henry III. was called upon by his title to the Empire, by his own grave and religious character, by the open or the tacit summons of the pious throughout Europe, and even of those who respected the Church: he was implored, in popular verse, to dissolve this odious Trigamy of the Church,<sup>2</sup> and to interpose his irresistible authority. He crossed the Alps, and was received either with loud acclamations or with silent awe. At Piacenza, Gregory, supposing his own claims to the papacy irrefragable, ventured to meet him.<sup>7</sup> Henry gave no answer, but advanced to Sutri, about thirty miles north of Rome. There he assembled

A.D. 1046.  
Dec. 20.

Degradation  
of Benedict  
IX. and  
Gregory VI.

a Council of many prelates: among them were the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Bishop of Augsburg, and the Archbishop of Arles. In this Council he proceeded to examine the claims of the conflicting Popes. Silvester was condemned at once as an usurper, and delivered up, degraded from his holy orders, to be imprisoned for life in a monastery. The voluntary abdication of Benedict annulled his claim.<sup>8</sup> Gregory fondly thought that there was now no obstacle to his universal recognition. But he was called upon to give an account of his own election. He could not deny, he could not attempt to extenuate the flagrant simony of those proceedings by which he had bought the papacy. He admitted his guilt, his disqualification, stripped off the pontifical robes, and intreating forgiveness, quietly surrendered up the papacy.<sup>9</sup> He retired, not without com-

\* "Una Summittis nupsit tribus maritis,  
Rex Henrice, Omnipotentis vice,  
Solve connubium triforme dubium."

<sup>7</sup> Some writers, summed up by Luden  
(Geschichte der Deutschen, vol. viii. p.

191), suppose a secret understanding  
between the Emperor and Pope Gregory.

<sup>8</sup> "Maximè cum ipse, Romanus Pontifex, se judicaverit deponendum."

<sup>9</sup> "Ego Gregorius Episcopus, servus

pulsion, into a monastery in Germany; his involuntary companion in his exile was no less than the famous Hildebrand.<sup>b</sup>

servorum Dei, propter turpissimam venalitatem simoniacæ heræseos, quæ antiqui hostis versutiâ meæ electioni irrepsit, a Romano episcopatu judico

me submovendum."—Bonizo. Victor in Dialog. lib. iii.

<sup>b</sup> Muratori, sub ann. 1046.

END OF VOL. II.

15.

W







This book should be returned to  
Library on or before the last d



